



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2020

Best Leadership Practices and Actions for Leading a Transition in Curriculum Framework in Secondary Schools

Jennifer Lynn Tyrrell

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Tyrrell, Jennifer Lynn, "Best Leadership Practices and Actions for Leading a Transition in Curriculum Framework in Secondary Schools" (2020). *Dissertations*. 3830.

https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3830

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 2020 Jennifer Lynn Tyrrell

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

BEST LEADERSHIP PRACTICES AND ACTIONS FOR LEADING A TRANSITION
IN CURRICULUM FRAMEWORK IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

PROGRAM IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND SUPERVISION

BY

JENNIFER L. TYRRELL

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MAY 2020

Copyright by Jennifer L. Tyrrell, 2020

All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, my deepest gratitude to my dissertation chair, Dr. Brigid Schultz, who is one of the best coaches I have ever had. I have always thought that all great coaches possess the innate ability to know when to firmly push and when to softly encourage; this truly defines Dr. Schultz's coaching. This journey has not been easy and I can confidently say that I would not have finished if it weren't for her support, guidance, persistence, and encouragement. I am forever indebted.

I would like to thank the 11 individuals that took the time to participate in this study. I know how busy each one of you is, so it means so much that you took the time to contribute to my research. Thank you for being unselfish with your time and contributing to research that instructional leaders can use as they navigate curricular change. To all educational leaders in the field, I encourage you to support others by saying yes when invited to participate; I know I will try to embrace a pay-it-forward mantra.

I would like to thank my dissertation committee: Dr. Michael Boyle and Dr. Ian MacLeod. Thank you for unselfishly agreeing to serve on my committee and providing me feedback that strengthened my work.

I would like to thank Dr. Stacey Gonzales for her generous friendship, guidance, and motivation throughout this dissertation journey. I needed every bit of your coaching

and appreciated the gentle and sometimes not-so-gentle encouragement to continue making progress.

A heartfelt thank you to the men and women of Consolidated High School District 230. You are my teachers, coaches, colleagues, and friends. Thank you for supporting me, teaching me, and caring for me as I have developed into a leader and learned along the journey. Special thanks to Dr. James Gay for believing in me, to Dr. Kim Dryier and Dr. Julia Wheaton for providing so much guidance, and to Eric Olsen for providing me so many opportunities.

To the students of Sandburg...your energy, passion, and kindness inspire me! I am the luckiest principal in the world...you have my heart! Thank you for teaching me the real meaning of EliteDaily! I love you all...

I cannot thank my family enough for their love and encouragement that has not only guided me through this dissertation journey, but that has guided me through life's journey. Mom and Dad, from an early age you instilled confidence in me that I could do anything I put my mind to. You always went along with my crazy and whether it was giving back a second team all-conference certificate because we all knew that I deserved a first team award or being a sounding board as I navigate personal and professional challenges, you always have my back. To my seester, Sarah, thank you for all the little things that you do for me that are actually big things; you have made my life better and easier; you know that finding time to do "life things" is hard for me and you unselfishly give your time so that I can spend mine serving others. Sarah, you are the kindest person with the biggest heart.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents.

Family has always been and will always be everything to me.

Your love and support have meant everything in my life.

I am who I am because of you...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
ABSTRACT	x

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Problem	1
Statement of the Problem.....	7
Purpose of the Study	8
Significance of the Study	8
Primary Research Questions	9
Research Design.....	10
Theoretical Framework	12
Assumptions, Limitations, and Scope (Delimitations)	14
II. REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE	17
Leadership.....	17
Leadership Theory	19
Educational Leadership.....	30
Change	49
Models of Change/Modern Change Theory	49
Educational Change	67
III. METHODOLOGY	80
Purpose of the Study	80
Research Questions and Specific Details of the Study	81
Population and Sample	85
Sampling Procedures	86
Research Design – Delphi Method	89
Data Collection and Instruments.....	92
Data Analysis	93
Role of the Researcher	97
Summary	98
IV. RESULTS	99
Methodology	99
Research Questions.....	104
Additional Input	105
Kotter’s Step 1 – Round 1.....	108

Kotter's Step 2 – Round 1	109
Kotter's Step 3 – Round 1	109
Kotter's Step 4 – Round 1	110
Kotter's Step 5 – Round 1	110
Kotter's Step 6 – Round 1	111
Kotter's Step 7 – Round 1	112
Kotter's Step 8 – Round 1	112
Other Insights – Round 1	113
Round 2	113
Kotter's Step 1 – Round 2	114
Kotter's Step 2 – Round 2	116
Kotter's Step 3 – Round 2	117
Kotter's Step 4 – Round 2	119
Kotter's Step 5 – Round 2	121
Kotter's Step 6 – Round 2	123
Kotter's Step 7 – Round 2	125
Kotter's Step 8 – Round 2	128
Other Insights – Round 2	131
Summary	133
V. DISCUSSION	134
Purpose of the Study	135
Research Questions	136
Methodology	136
Discussion/Findings	137
Theme Number 1: The Why	139
Theme Number 2: Selecting and Supporting Leadership	141
Theme Number 3: Celebrating Successes	143
Theme Number 4: Showing Gratitude	143
Theme Number 5: Adjust When Necessary	144
Theme Number 6: Communication	145
Theme Number 7: Multiple Stakeholders	147
Recommendations for Future Research	149
Limitations	153
Summary	154
APPENDIX	
A. INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT AND INFORMED CONSENT	156
B. QUESTIONNAIRE 1	161
C. QUESTIONNAIRE 2	166
D. VERIFICATION OF RESPONSES	184
E. SAMPLE OF PARTICIPANT RESPONSES	186
F. SAMPLE OF PARTICIPANT CODED RESPONSES	189

G. ADDITIONAL EMAILS TO PARTICIPANTS	192
H. PERMISSION TO REPLICATE	195
I. DELPHI METHOD – RESEARCHER’S REFLECTION	198
REFERENCE LIST	202
VITA.....	212

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Participant and School/District Demographic Information	102
2. Kotter's Change Framework as Presented within Data Collection Instruments.....	106
3. Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level.....	115
4. Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level.....	117
5. Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level.....	119
6. Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level.....	121
7. Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level.....	123
8. Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level.....	125
9. Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level.....	127
10. Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level.....	130
11. Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level for Other Insights	132
12. Seven Practices/Actions Identified by Participants with High Consensus	139

ABSTRACT

Instructional leadership is one of the primary responsibilities of administrators within secondary schools. As administrators assume the role of instructional leaders, it is important to note that having the ability to guide a school or district through the process of organizational change is critical. Specifically, within the area of curriculum, change is constantly occurring. This qualitative research study was designed to identify a list of best leadership practices/actions for instructional leaders to use when leading a school or district through the process of changing its framework for curriculum development. The researcher replicated the research of Alexander Carter (2016) who studied transition from traditional grading systems to standards-based systems. The conceptual framework was Kotter's change model.

A sample of 11 administrators and department chairs working in instructional leadership positions within schools that are members of the Chicago Area Directors of Curriculum and Assessment (CADCA) elected to serve as participants. The participants completed a questionnaire aimed to identify best leadership practices and actions instructional leaders should consider as they plan for leading a school or district through changing its framework for curriculum development. Responses were coded and verified by participants; a second questionnaire, which included 120 best leadership practices and actions was developed and administered to participants. Seven practices were identified as having "very high" consensus and 62 as having "acceptable" consensus. The seven

practices aligned to the following steps within Kotter's Change Framework: Establish a Sense of Urgency, Creating a Guiding Coalition, Creating a Change Vision, Empower Broad Based Action, Generate Short-Term Wins, and Incorporate Change into the Culture. The following themes were identified for consideration when leading change in curriculum framework: The Why, Selecting and Supporting Leadership, Celebrating Successes, Showing Gratitude, Adjust when Necessary, Communication, and Multiple Stakeholders. The list of seven "very high" consensus practices and themes identified from this research can assist secondary school administrators and department chairs when planning and leading change in curriculum framework.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The primary responsibility for secondary school administrators is to ensure the learning, achievement and growth of all students. Guaranteeing the curriculum, as well as sound instructional and assessment practices is essential in achieving optimal results. Instructional leadership within the areas of curriculum, assessment, and instruction is central to being an effective secondary school leader (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Also integral to the instructional leadership role, is the ability to guide a district or school through the process of organizational change. In order to lead a district or school through the change process, the instructional leader must be attentive to the steps critical to implementation of the change process. Specifically, within the area of curriculum, change is constantly occurring.

Background of the Problem

While the primary focus of the educational leader should be the learning, growth, and achievement of all students by ensuring quality curriculum, instruction and assessment practices within the school, the educational leader must also be an agent that has the ability to guide the organization through change. Current landscape within education results in change being ever-present in schools. An increase in accountability, evolution of trends and best practices within curriculum, assessment, and instruction,

school culture, intervention, and constant monitoring of progress and results contribute to a culture of change being common in schools.

Legislation and federal mandates have contributed to the changing landscape of education over the course of the last thirty plus years. *A Nation at Risk* (NCEE, 1983) was significant in creating reform in education in the United States. The report highlighted not only the significance of teacher preparation prior to joining the profession, but also the lack of productivity and professionalism teachers displayed once in the field. The inadequacies outlined in the report within the areas of content, expectations, teaching, and time supported the need for heightened management of the instructional program. The instructional program includes the interplay of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, but does not account for the human element as essential to drive the school improvement process.

Also significant in the form of legislation was the signing of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)*. President Bush signed the act on January 8, 2002, in the attempt to not only ensure accountability but also to increase federal support of education. *NCLB* held schools and districts accountable for a successful educational experience for all students (Johnstone, Dikkers, & Luedeke, 2009). One can see the impact of *NCLB* (2002) given the following components: improving the academic achievement of economically disadvantaged, preparing, training and recruiting highly qualified teachers and principals, language instruction for limited English proficient and immigrant students, giving parents choice and creating innovative educational programs, making the education system accountable, making the system responsive to local need, helping all children learn to read, and helping children with disabilities. Although several

indicators were used to determine if schools were in good standing under *NCLB*, the accountability measures connected to testing were widely recognized (Linn, Baker, Betebenner, 2002). Under *NCLB* (2002), states were required to set standards for achievement at each grade level and develop a system in order to monitor the progress of all students and subgroups in meeting the standards. *No Child Left Behind* required a new approach to educational leadership in order to navigate elements such as standards-based curriculum, state testing systems, and school ratings based on student performance (Howard, 2005).

The evolution in standards driving educational practice continued with the development of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in 2009. State leaders, through their membership in the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), began to develop the standards in 2009 and the CCSS, along with a report validating the process and work of the committee, were officially released in June of 2010. The primary goal of the CCSS is to ensure that all students exit high school prepared for college, career, and life by implementing consistent learning goals across all states. Standard development was informed by current standards, experts in the field, and public feedback and addressed the lack of standardization across states. After the standards were released, states then undertook their own process for reviewing and adopting the standards. With the adoption of the CCSS, school leaders have the responsibility of leading staff through implementation. The process of aligning to and implementing the CCSS is complex because it inherently requires leadership to successfully facilitate the change process. Relevant to this research, Eilers and D'Amico (2012) reference essential elements that

could be considered best practices within Kotter's (1996, 2012) change framework, which was the foundation for this research. Eilers and D'Amico (2012) assert the following six essential elements as critical to the implementation of the CCSS: establishing purpose, setting priorities, aligning personnel with curricular needs, practicing professional discourse, encouraging risk taking, and providing feedback.

Instructional leaders are tasked with not only aligning curriculum to the CCSS, but also more globally with ensuring a guaranteed and viable curriculum. The same inadequacies that were outlined in the *Nation at Risk* report within the areas of content, expectations, teaching, and time are currently addressed when curriculum leadership is employed within the school's organizational structure and embedded within its mission. Knowledge of and involvement in the school's curriculum, instruction, and assessment are critical to principal leadership (Marzano et al., 2005).

An evolution in leadership practice has also influenced the current landscape of education. During the time of heightened accountability, educational leaders began to grapple with not only the impact of leadership styles on schools but also with the dilemma of choosing a style. Strong educational leaders have uncovered the benefit of combining the use of all leadership styles in order to see transformation in school districts. Essentially, implementation that includes an overlap in constructs results in leadership effectiveness (Golm, 2009). Successful leaders have the ability to situationally use the appropriate style or assign tasks based on preference of leadership style.

Parallel to a shift toward accountability in schools in terms of curriculum, instruction, supervision, and achievement, a shift in desired leadership practices also

surfaced. As leadership continued to evolve as a construct in schools, standards for educational leadership were developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) that outlined both expectations and roles of school administrators (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996). The intent of the document was to encourage communication about effective school leadership among stakeholders and to provide content that would lead to improvement in educational leadership within schools (CCSSO, 1996).

Additionally, a shift toward consideration of the human element of leadership was explored by Sergiovanni (1992) in *Moral Leadership: Getting to the Heart of School Improvement*. Within both the professional and moral sources of authority, the desired response from teachers comes from within rather than being imposed upon them; neither is management or leadership heavy. Professional authority assumes that the knowledge and expertise of the teacher is what counts most. The corresponding leadership strategy includes promoting dialogue around professional values and standards, requiring teachers to hold each other accountable for meeting standards, and making professional development opportunities available to teachers (Sergiovanni, 1992). Moral authority assumes that schools operate as professional learning communities, with teachers sharing in values, beliefs and commitments. Moral leaders define the values and beliefs to be held at the center of the school as a community, create norms to govern behavior, and rely on members of the community to respond to duties and obligations. Moral leadership results in teachers responding “to shared commitments and felt interdependence” (p. 31).

As is true within the area of leadership, an evolution in change theory has also influenced the current landscape of education. A detailed account of the development of change theory over the course of the last 50 years is included within Chapter II. One thing has remained constant; change is difficult. Although, it is of import to study change because reform, evolution, and innovation are part of the landscape when providing leadership in education. In *Leading in a Culture of Change* (2001), Michael Fullan, an expert in the field of organizational change primarily within the context of education, suggests:

CHANGE IS A DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD. ITS RELENTLESS pace these days runs us off our feet. Yet when things are unsettled, we can find new ways to move ahead and to create breakthroughs not possible in stagnant societies. If you ask people to brainstorm words to describe change, they come up with a mixture of negative and positive terms. On the one side, *fear, anxiety, loss, danger, panic*; on the other, *exhilaration, risk-taking, excitement, improvements, energizing*. For better or for worse, change arouses emotions, and when emotions intensify, leadership is key. (p. 1)

Change, which elicits a variety of emotions, is a constant within the areas of curriculum, assessment, and instruction. Curriculum processes are characterized by ongoing change in order to yield constant improvement. Instructional leaders within secondary schools are faced with the constant challenge of leading curricular change. Although, leading curricular change is only part of the vast responsibilities of instructional leaders. Instructional leaders can utilize change theory and frameworks in order to implement change successfully, although there is a gap in the research needed to

support the change process of implementing a new curriculum framework. This research addresses the gap in knowledge, as the group of experienced participants has identified a list of leadership best practices and actions for leaders to apply when implementing a new curriculum framework.

Statement of the Problem

Secondary school administrators and department chairs that work within the area of instructional leadership are regularly tasked with leading the organization through the change process. The ability to successfully lead change efforts is integral to instructional leadership. Many frameworks exist for leading successful change within the areas of business and education. In fact, many steps and characteristics are represented across frameworks. In many cases, frameworks can be generally applied to leading change, but lack in specificity needed for application to the educational change process. There is a gap in knowledge within the area of leadership best practices and actions that support successful change within the implementation of a new framework for curriculum development. Instructional leaders tasked with leading districts through a transition in curriculum framework could gain advantage from having a list of recommended best leadership practices and actions for consultation.

Within schools and districts, changes within the areas of curriculum, assessment, and instruction are constantly happening. This research sets out to support instructional leaders in successfully leading districts and schools through a change in curriculum framework. Leveraging the list of best practices and actions identified by experienced participants through this research will help support leaders in implementing the process of changing curriculum framework.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to discover if a panel of experienced instructional leaders working at the secondary school or district level could come to consensus on best practices to be considered when leading a school or district through a change in curriculum framework. Qualitative methodology was used in order to build consensus related to leadership practices for instructional leaders to consider when leading a change in curriculum framework. The study began with the researcher selecting a panel of participants, based on the participants' experience leading a district or school through the process of changing its framework for curriculum development. Once the panel of participants was assembled, the Delphi method was employed. The researcher administered a series of questionnaires to the participants and consensus on best leadership practices and actions was gained.

Significance of the Study

Providing leadership within the area of curriculum is a primary responsibility of instructional leaders in secondary schools. Because curriculum development, revision, and implementation is a cyclical process, change is inevitable. This research may be of significance to secondary school administrators and department chairs, specifically instructional leaders that work in the area of curriculum leadership. More specifically, those charged with leading schools or districts through the process of changing framework for curriculum development are the target audience for application of this research. Instructional leaders within secondary schools have an overwhelming amount of responsibilities associated with administering the instructional programming in a district or school. The identification of a list of best leadership practices and actions for

instructional leaders to consider when leading a change within the area of curriculum framework is of significance to those leading future efforts. This research was completed in order to provide instructional leaders a supporting framework for leading major change within the area of curriculum framework implementation. The recommended leadership practices and actions are available for consult by those leading such efforts within secondary districts and schools and provide some insight into facilitating a successful change when implementing a new curriculum framework.

Primary Research Questions

As stated within the problem statement, change is a constant within the areas of curriculum, assessment, and instruction. Curriculum processes are iterative and are characterized by cyclical change in order to yield constant improvement. Instructional leaders within secondary schools are faced with the constant challenge of leading curricular change. This study focused on instructional leaders within secondary schools and districts that have successfully led a change in curriculum framework. The researcher utilized a panel of experienced individuals within the field; participants were deemed qualified if they are in instructional leadership positions, have led a secondary school or district through a change in framework for curriculum development within the last five years, and the school or district continued to use the framework or an enhanced version of the framework for at least one year after initial implementation. The following questions have been answered in relation to leading curricular change:

RQ1: What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as *best practices* when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

RQ2: Does consensus exist among experienced instructional leaders for the set, or subset, of practices discovered by the first research question?

Research Design

The Delphi method was used as the qualitative research method within this study. Data analysis within the Delphi method can be both qualitative and quantitative, as the type of data collected determines analysis (Warner, 2014). The methodology used for this research in the form of Delphi method included both qualitative and quantitative data analysis. Linstone and Turoff (2002) suggest quantitative techniques offer a deeper level of analysis of data gathered through Delphi.

The Delphi method is utilized for consensus building among experts in an identified field (Brady, 2015; Hsu & Sandford, 2007). The Delphi method is a unique research method, as it is an iterative data collection process, which is informed by the responses of the expert participants to questionnaires that are utilized as the data collection instruments (Brady, 2015; Hsu & Sandford, 2007). The structures of the Delphi method not only allow for participant anonymity, but also allows for participants' voices to be captured in a fashion that they carry equal weight and are represented within the research findings (Hsu & Sandford, 2007).

The target population for this research study was secondary school administrators and department chairs, specifically instructional leaders serving in positions with a curriculum emphasis that have been involved in leading a transition in curriculum framework within the last five years. The researcher targeted a minimum of five and a maximum of 24 secondary school or district instructional leaders that have successfully led a transition in curriculum framework to serve as experienced participants within this

research. Specifically, the researcher targeted individuals holding the following positions: Assistant Superintendents for Instruction, Directors of Curriculum, Principals, Associate or Assistant Principals, and Division or Department Chairs.

Three instruments were used within this research: an invitation to participate, round one questionnaire, and round two questionnaire. The invitation to participate (see Appendix A) confirmed qualification of secondary school administrators to participate, outlined steps of the research study, and described the response potential participants would need to take to confirm interest in participation and consent. Within questionnaire one (see Appendix B) participants were asked to identify leadership practices and actions that instructional leaders should consider as best leadership practices when navigating the process of changing curriculum framework, within the context of Kotter's (1996, 2012) change framework. Questionnaire two (see Appendix C) was developed from the unique list of leadership practices that were identified through administration of questionnaire one. Within questionnaire two, participants rated each unique practice on a Likert scale, indicating how critical the practice or action was to the success of the change effort.

The researcher targeted instructional leaders working within schools represented within the Chicago Area Directors of Curriculum and Assessment (CADCA) organization. Specifically, the researcher targeted secondary schools within CADCA and those individuals working within instructional leadership positions with those schools.

After identifying the initial list of potential participants, the individuals were sent the invitation to participate, which included criteria to participate (see Appendix A). The initial participant list was created based on the response to the invitation, commitment, and consent of participants. Participants had two weeks to confirm participation. Once

participants confirmed participation, they were sent questionnaire one (see Appendix B). Participants had two weeks to complete questionnaire one and then had an opportunity to review individual responses prior to the researcher finalizing questionnaire two (see Appendix C). Participants then had two weeks to complete questionnaire two. The researcher then analyzed the results of questionnaire two in order to identify the list of best leadership practices and actions that experienced participants deemed critical to the successful implementation of a new curriculum framework. The following were analyzed in order to determine consensus: mean, interquartile range (IQR), and average percent majority opinion (APMO). Statistics and data analysis procedures will be further described within Chapter III.

Theoretical Framework

Kotter's (1996, 2012) change framework served as the theoretical framework for this research. Specifically, within this study, the researcher used Kotter's framework to identify specific best leadership practices to guide instructional leaders through the change process of implementing a new curriculum framework. Within this qualitative study, the researcher aimed to identify a set of best leadership practices and actions that instructional leaders can apply when leading a district or school through the transition to a new curriculum framework. The following are the eight steps, including brief descriptions of types of actions that fall within each step, that comprise Kotter's framework:

- Establishing a sense of urgency - Actions that craft and use a significant opportunity as a means for exciting people to sign up to change their organization.

- Creating a guiding coalition - Actions taken to assemble a group with the power and energy to lead and support a collaborative change effort.
- Developing a vision and strategy - Actions to shape a vision to help steer the change effort and develop strategic initiatives to achieve that vision.
- Communicating the change vision - Actions designed to energize the people who are ready, willing, and urgent to drive change.
- Empowering employees for broad-based action - Actions that encourage change, remove obstacles to change, or change systems or structures that pose threats to the achievement of the vision.
- Generating short-term wins - Actions designed to produce, track, evaluate and celebrate volumes of small and large accomplishments and correlate them to results.
- Consolidating gains and producing more change - Actions focused on increasing credibility to change systems, promote and develop employees who can implement the vision; reinvigorate the process with new projects, themes and volunteers.
- Anchoring new approaches - Actions that make connections between the new behaviors and organizational success, and develop the means to ensure leadership development and succession.

Because change is difficult, the first four stages help to break down the current reality. Stages five to seven connect to the actual change and adjusted practices, while the final stage attaches to the change becoming part of the fabric of the culture of the organization. People often skip steps of the change process, move too quickly through

the steps, or fail to continue to nurture earlier stages once they have moved on; all of which have an impact on the successful implementation of the change process. Kotter (1996, 2012) asserts that successful changes go through all eight stages, with some operating in multiple phases at the same time.

The researcher used Kotter's Framework (1996, 2012) as the theoretical framework and replicated the research of Alexander Carter (2016). Carter conducted a qualitative study in which he used Kotter's framework to examine the leadership of the transition from traditional model of grading and reporting to a standards-based grading and reporting model. Carter conducted his research in order to identify a set of best leadership practices that principals can apply when leading this type of transition within a middle school or high school, aligned to Kotter's framework. Within this research, the researcher used Kotter's framework to examine curricular change in order to identify leadership best practices to guide instructional leaders when transitioning to a new curriculum framework.

Assumptions, Limitations, and Scope (Delimitations)

One of the major assumptions included within the initial research proposal is that those administrators and department chairs that are leading a district or school through the process of changing framework for curriculum development will utilize this research. It is also assumed that the list of best leadership practices and actions that has been generated will support secondary school instructional leaders in leading a district or school through the change process. Also central to the research is the assumption that the sample of instructional leaders that were selected as experienced participants for this research offered feedback that is representative of the larger body of secondary school

instructional leaders that are leading districts and schools through the process of changing framework for curriculum development. Finally, in utilizing questionnaires as the instruments for data collection within this qualitative research, the researcher operated under the assumption that the experienced participants offered their honest feedback when answering the initial open-ended question within the context of Kotter (1996, 2012) and when rating the subsequent practices on questionnaire number two.

The initial research proposal acknowledged that the following limitations could present during the course of this research. First, the researcher could have been limited on the number of experienced participants that qualified for the study based on the parameters outlined within the invitation. The researcher used the limited list of secondary schools represented within CADCA and subsequently public websites to identify potential participants for the research. The researcher was limited on the total number of participants that committed to participation. Because the Delphi method is an iterative process, the researcher was also limited by the number of participants that were retained throughout the course of the study. The Delphi design follows a format that uses multiple questionnaires throughout the duration of the study. Once potential participants were identified, they had to engage in multiple steps throughout the study: response to the invitation to participate based on qualification to participate and commitment, questionnaire one, review of individual responses to questionnaire one, and questionnaire two. Because of this iterative process, retaining participants was limitation. Another potential limitation is that the list of consensus best practices that resulted from the research were derived solely based on the unique experiences that the instructional

leaders had in implementing a successful change within the area of changing curriculum framework.

The scope of this study focused on secondary school instructional leaders that have led schools or districts through the process of successfully changing framework for curriculum development. Specifically, the target population was instructional leaders that have been involved in leading a transition in curriculum framework within the last five years. Participants were deemed qualified to participate if they are in instructional leadership positions, have led a secondary school or district through a change in framework for curriculum development within the last five years, and the school or district continued to use the framework or an enhanced version of the framework for at least one year after initial implementation. Participants were identified based on the fact that their position is within the realm of instructional leadership, therefore a range of positions are represented within the experienced panel. Participants were identified and invited to participate based on a two-part review. The researcher first reviewed the list of CADCA schools and then used the list of secondary schools and districts to search public websites in order to identify specific individuals to send the initial invitation to participate. CADCA will be further described within Chapter III.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Leadership

As a field of study, leadership is not only complex but also large in scope. Many academics have studied leadership theory and practices throughout time, resulting in a myriad of characteristics being attached to leadership as a construct. Although a full review of relevant literature is not possible, this review will focus on historical trends in leadership from the 1970s through the beginning of the 21st century. A review of leadership theory and practice is relevant as the researcher investigated leadership of the change process relevant to a shift in district-level curriculum development framework and process. It is of import to study leadership and change because of the congruent relationship between the two. In *Leadership* (1978), James Burns, who is considered the founder of modern leadership theory, suggests:

I define leadership as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivation – the wants and the needs, the aspirations and expectations – of both leaders and followers. And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers' values and motivations. (p. 19)

Leadership has been defined in many different ways throughout time. As a construct, leadership dates back to ancient times. Throughout history, leadership has

been viewed within the context of civilization, with particular attention given to both the civilization shaping and developing leaders and leaders having a similar significant impact on shaping civilization (Landis, Hill & Harvey, 2014). Whereas leadership is a difficult concept to understand, it has evolved since early discussion with the ancient works of Cesar, Plato, and Plutarch (Marzano et al., 2005). According to Bass (1990), “great leaders were important in the development of civilized societies” (p. 3). According to Chinese history, Confucius led in a way that a moral example was set. Plato believed that the leader was the most important governmental figure. Aristotle operated under the premise that political figures lacked meaning and virtue. Machiavelli called for leaders to be firm and steady (Landis et al., 2014).

In evaluating success of organizations, leadership is widely recognized as one of the most important factors (Landis et al., 2014). In studying leadership, Bass and Stogdill’s, *Handbook of Leadership* provides a historical account of leadership and its evolution. Bass (1990) detailed the studies of Katzell and Guzzo that revealed that supervisory methods are effective in terms of increasing output. Bass further attributed military successes to leadership, “Leadership has been considered a critical factor in military successes since records have been kept; that is better-led forces have been victorious over poorly led forces” (p. 9). Regardless if leadership theory is being used within business, education, or other areas, “If a theory of leadership is to be used for diagnosis, training, and development, it must be theory grounded in the concepts and assumptions that are acceptable to and used by managers, officials, and emergent leaders” (Bass, 1990, p. 37). A majority of the theories outlined in this review first originated and were applied within the context of business. The modern leadership research included

within this review has also been applied to education and has been specifically applied to leading change. Many of the theories outlined within this review have aspects that are applicable within present day leadership. Specifically, leadership practices embedded within the theories will be described, which aligns to the researcher's exploration of the best leadership practices school leaders should consider when leading a change in curriculum framework.

Leadership Theory

Situational and contingency approaches to leadership, which surfaced in the late 1960s and early 1970s, respectively, are often partnered within the literature because both highlight the importance of context in which the leadership behavior is exhibited.

Contingency model of leadership is built on the premise that performance is contingent on motivational pattern of the leader and the degree of influence and power the leader has (Badshah, 2012). Conditions are relevant because performance of the leader is impacted by the situation. According to Fiedler's, 1967 Contingency Theory of Leadership, the following dimensions impact whether or not a leadership situation is favorable or unfavorable for any leader: (1) leader-member relations - power and influence increase when leaders are liked and respected by members; (2) task structure - structured tasks give the leader more influence; and (3) influence and power of a leader increases if the individual has positional power in areas such as hiring, firing, and disciplining (Badshah, 2012). Presently, contingency model of leadership is applicable because of the tendency of leadership to evaluate situations as favorable or unfavorable. The dimensions signifying a situation as favorable or unfavorable may be more complex than first

outlined within Fiedler's Contingency Theory, but conditions continue to be relevant and impact performance.

Situational Leadership Theory, first coined by Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard in the early 1970s, can be applied to the fields of business and education (Hambleton & Gumbert, 1982). The theory, which evolved from their Life-Cycle Theory of Leadership, was developed to aid those with positional influence in having more effective daily interactions (Hambleton & Gumbert, 1982). Hersey and Blanchard began referring to leadership as situational within the 1972 edition of *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources* (Hersey & Blanchard, 1996). Within situational leadership, task and relationship behaviors are emphasized (Hersey & Blanchard, 1996). Hambleton and Gumbert (1982) define task behaviors as being represented by one-way communication by the leader relevant to expectations being outlined for the follower and relationship behaviors as being represented by two-way communication and a supportive context.

The interplay among direction and support, as well as the maturity of the follower serves as the basis for situational leadership (Hambleton & Gumbert, 1982). Four leadership styles emerge as a result of high and low levels of task and relationship behavior, ranging from high task, high relationship to low task, low relationship (Hambleton & Gumbert, 1982). In essence, they asserted that there was not a best leadership style for managers (Hersey & Blanchard, 1996); effectiveness is related to the situation it is applied to. This assertion continues to be significant in current practice as leadership style and practice is often adjusted based on situation or personnel. Contingency and situational approaches are relevant to this research because of the

importance of context within the theories. Context will be considered when examining leadership of the change process relevant to a shift in district-level curriculum development process and framework.

An emphasis on position of leadership within the organization is included within *Servant leadership*, which can be traced back to the work of Robert Greenleaf (1970). Greenleaf introduced the concept in his essay *Servant as Leader*, in which he highlights service to others as the determinant of greatness as a leader. Servant leadership places the leader not at the top of the organization, but at the center of the organization. The central position communicates that the leader works with all members of the organization. A foundational premise behind servant leadership is that the desire to help others results in effective leadership (Greenleaf, 1970, 1977).

The servant leader has the desire to motivate followers and does so by fostering a caring environment and developing a quality relationship (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002). In the article, *Servant Leadership and the Greenleaf Legacy*, Spears (1995) identified 10 characteristics that result from servant leadership: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to growing people, and building community. More recently, Marzano et al. (2005) summarized the critical attributes of the servant leader as understanding the personal need of individuals within the organization, dealing with the impact of conflict within the organization, managing the resources of the organization, developing the skills of those in the organization, and effectively listening to those within the organization. Whereas the construct of servant leadership has continued to evolve throughout time, it continues to be based on the leader

placing emphasis on the feelings, needs, and development of members of the organization.

Max Weber (1947), the first to introduce *charismatic leadership*, described such leaders as those who, “reveal a transcendent mission or course of action which may be in itself appealing to the potential followers, but which is acted on because the followers believe their leader is extraordinarily gifted” (p. 358). The “gift” that Weber details is actually a combination of personal characteristics and behaviors of the leader, as well as characteristics of the followers as well as situational context.

House (1977) extended Weber’s work on charismatic leadership, identifying five propositions of charismatic leadership. First, in looking at the characteristics that distinguish charismatic leaders, he identified, “dominance and self-confidence, need for influence, and a strong conviction in the moral righteousness of their beliefs” (p. 11). The second proposition details the behaviors the follower will model based on perceptions of the leader. Favorable perceptions of the leader will result in the following being similar within the follower and the leader: valences, expectations, emotional response to work, and attitude (House, 1977).

If the second proposition is true, it can be inferred that charismatic leaders engage in behaviors that they want followers to model and also that they desire their actions to be identified by followers as favorable. In his third proposition, House (1977) described the charismatic leader as engaging in behaviors that result in an impression of competence and success in contrast to leaders who do not have charismatic effect on followers. Proposition four states, that leaders with charismatic effects are more likely to articulate ideological goals. Finally, proposition five details the desired combination of setting high

expectations and having confidence in followers which results in followers striving to meet performance standards. House details the synthesis of all propositions, “Leaders who have charismatic effects are more likely to engage in behaviors that arouse motives relevant to the accomplishment of the mission than are leaders who do not have charismatic effects” (p. 25). While charismatic leadership originated as a construct in the 1950’s, personal characteristics and behaviors of leadership continue to impact motivation of followership.

Transformational and transactional leadership theories are rooted in the work of James Burns, which dates back to the 1970’s, and are used to discuss leadership in business and education (Marzano et al., 2005). Hollander (1974) extended the work of Burns and defined leadership as a transactional process. The behaviors associated with leadership are not relevant to one leader acting alone, but are also related to the followers and based on context of situation. In order to identify transactional leadership, the following variables relative to both the leader and the follower as well as context need to be considered: personality, perception and resources relevant to goal attainment. Transactional leadership presents itself as a two-way influence relationship and can be explained as offering rewards in exchange for compliance (Sims, Faraj, & Yun, 2009). As a result, transactional leadership can have positive impact on followers’ performance.

The transactional leader focuses on management tasks and thus can be effective in meeting deadlines (Burke, Stagal, Klein, Goodwin, Sales, & Halpin, 2006). There are three types of transactional leaders. Within the contingent reward category, rewards are offered when outlined criteria are met. In the management by exception – active,

leadership attempts to intervene prior to followers' behaviors becoming problematic.

Conversely, the transactional leader that falls in the management by exception – passive category will also intervene, but will do so when behaviors have already become problematic (Horwitz, Horwitz, Daram, Brandt, Brunicardi, & Awad, 2008).

Unlike the transactional leaders, transformational leaders motivate and inspire (Bass, 2008). Bass (1985) was the first to contrast the two types of leadership. Transformational leaders recognize the potential of followers and use Maslow's hierarchy of needs to engage followers. Transformational leaders are mentors (Vinkenbunrg, Van Engen, Eagly, & Johannesen-Shmidt, 2011). They have a clear vision and identify individual differences in followership in order to inspire and develop strengths (Bass, 2008). They motivate in hopes that individuals will be compelled to pursue the team's vision (Sims et al., 2009). Followers feel valued when they have input into the vision, which also positively impacts the relationship between the leader and the follower. In addition, ownership of the vision also increases, resulting in increased morale and building capacity for leadership (Rolfe, 2011).

Badshah (2012) summarized transformation as being achieved by making followership more aware of desired outcomes and ways the outcomes could be accomplished, interest of the individuals going beyond self-interest and being more about the good of the team or organization, and raising the level of need of the individual in connection to the organization. Similarly, Horwitz et al. (2008) identified three types of transformational leadership. Through inspirational motivation, leaders influence followers to achieve goals through charismatic communication methods. Idealized influence occurs in the form of the leader forming strong relationships with followers and

in the form of the ideal behavior of the leader being observed through the values and actions within the organization. Finally, intellectual stimulation is used to encourage followers to not only think creatively but also pursue new ideas. More often, transformational leaders have a democratic style, grounded in the belief that workers are motivated to do well and committed to sharing responsibility with followers (Bass, 2008). Building trust is an important characteristic of transformational leadership because of the connection to change. Transformational leaders motivate others to change (Grimm, 2010). Bass (2008) suggests that transformational leadership should be combined with the transactional style of management in order to accomplish all goals of an organization.

Golm (2009) studied the impact of transactional and transformational leadership on leading organizational change. Specifically, she studied the relationship between styles of leadership and collective impact. Golm collected data on 347 upper level executives that had attended a leadership development program. Findings support the impact of transactional leadership in predicting change-oriented leadership. When looking at the relationship between transactional and transformational leadership on change leadership, both resulted in a significant relationship, but transactional leadership explained more variance in change leadership as compared to transformational leadership. When examining transactional, transformational, and change-oriented leadership collectively, findings reflected a significant impact on leadership effectiveness, although findings did not indicate any of the styles as being more important. Findings support the overlap of the constructs in impacting leadership effectiveness, which is significant to this research because best leadership practices and

actions for leading curricular change have been identified within the context of Kotter's (1996, 2012) change model.

Elements of both transactional and transformational leadership are relevant within contemporary leadership. Leading within an organization necessitates presence of both types of leadership in order to meet management expectations while also motivating and inspiring followership.

Edward Deming is considered founder of *total quality management* (TQM), which surfaced in the late 1980's (Marzano et al., 2005). As with transformational and transactional leadership, the foundations can be applied to current leadership in both business and education. Waldman (1993) organized Deming's 14 points into five that describe effective leadership practices – change agency, teamwork, continuous improvement, trust building, and eradication of short-term goals. Significant to the research, the identified practices are represented within Kotter's stages.

Sosik and Dionne (1997) explain change agency within the context of the leader's ability to enact change in an organization; teamwork as individuals working together toward a larger purpose in the interest of the organization; and trust building as, "the process of establishing respect and instilling faith into followers based on leader integrity, honesty, and openness" (p. 450). The capacity to enact change continues to be a characteristic synonymous with modern leadership.

Deming (1986) explains that keeping goals in front of the organization and regularly evaluating the effectiveness is part of the continuous improvement process. Additionally, Deming looked at the goal setting process with a focus on long-term

outcome. Goals are more often than not embedded within an implementation plan for leading an organization through change.

Major shifts in leadership have surfaced within the last 15 years. In reviewing contemporary leadership theory and practice within the early years of the 21st century, the study of leadership has evolved in such a way that the focus is no longer on studying only the leader, “but also on followers, peers, supervisors, work setting/context, and culture” (Avolio, Walumbwa & Weber, 2009, p. 422).

Luthans and Avolio (2003) introduced the concept of *authentic leadership*. They defined authentic leadership as, “a process that draws from both positive psychological capacities and a highly developed organizational context, which results in both greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors on the part of the leaders and the associates, fostering positive self-development” (p. 243). Similar to other leadership theories introduced, leader, follower, and context are considered within authentic leadership. The literature cites four components that makeup authentic leadership: balanced processing, internalized moral perspective, relational transparency, and self-awareness (Avolio et al., 2009).

Those who study *shared leadership* generally view it more as a process versus an individual engaging the members of the team. Shared leadership is an interactive process in which members of the group, often through hierarchical influence, lead each other to the accomplishment of group or organizational goals (Pearce & Conger, 2003). Shared leadership is distributed within a team, rather than concentrated in one member serving in a supervisory position, with a focus on team-level outcomes (Day, Gronn, & Salas, 2004; Pearce & Conger, 2003). This is pertinent to the research because when examining

districts that have undergone change to the curriculum development process, leadership practices of all members of the instructional leadership group will be explored.

In studying *modern leadership*, Jim Collins (2001) is widely recognized in relation to leading change. Leadership is a critical element to executing change within an organization. Within his 2001 book, *Good to Great*, Jim Collins defines the type of leadership that fosters a good to great movement as Level 5 leadership. Level 5 leadership refers to a hierarchical structure that defines levels of leadership. Level 5 leaders exhibit the qualities of the other types of leaders, but have a unique blend of multifaceted personality characteristics, while operating for the good of the organization. Level 5 leaders strive for the success of the organization in generations that follow their direct involvement with the organization. Good-to-great leaders focus on the success of the company, other executives, and collective leadership to produce extraordinary results for the organization. They do whatever it takes to make the organization great; they are not only highly motivated but focused on producing results. Good-to-great leaders look beyond themselves when crediting the successes of the organization, yet take ownership for difficulties or failures that the organization may encounter (Collins, 2001).

Within the good to great framework, Collins (2001) proposes that two categories of people exist, those that have the qualities to be Level 5 and those that do not. Some people do not have the qualities to take an organization from good-to-great; work is about “fame, fortune, adulation, power, whatever – not what they *build*, create, and contribute” (p. 36). The second group of people have the potential to become Level 5 leaders and under the proper context can mature into Level 5 leaders. Level 5 leaders exist in society, within all organizations, but it is a matter of knowing what to look for (Collins, 2001).

Gray (2005) conducted a qualitative study of the characteristics and behaviors highly successful principals exhibited in comparison to those qualities outlined by Collins. Gray utilized the California Academic Performance Similar Schools rankings in order to identify and interview six highly successful principals and five comparison principals from San Diego, Orange and Riverside County Schools. Semi-structured interviews were conducted in order to examine whether or not the characteristics of the high successful principals were similar to those that Collins identified when exploring highly successful business leaders. Additionally, she examined influence that educational and life experiences had on the leadership capacity of principals. As a result, Gray found that in no case did highly successful principals reference all of the characteristics that Collins includes within his Level 5 leadership framework. Although, when considering all of the evidence collected through the interview process, all of the characteristics and behaviors were represented. In addition to the characteristics and behaviors directly connected to the work of Collins, evidence connected to the ability to build relationships also surfaced through Gray's research.

A review of literature on the evolution of leadership theory and practice from the 1970s through the beginning of the 21st century is relevant in providing background regarding general leadership principles. A review of leadership theory and practice is relevant as the researcher explored best leadership practices and actions, aligned to Kotter's Eight-Stages, in order to guide the leadership of the change process within the context of a shift in district level curriculum framework and development process. Kotter's Stages served as the theoretical framework as the researcher explored best leadership practices included within the change process. Within this review of relevant

literature, the researcher will also provide an overview of the evolution of educational leadership, change theory, and educational change over the course of the last fifty years.

Educational Leadership

The primary responsibility of the principal is to ensure effective teaching and learning within the school, with a focus on the achievement of all students. The aim of instructional leadership is to improve outcomes for all students. The school leader is responsible for ensuring a guaranteed curriculum, developing teachers, fostering a professional learning community, and building a leadership team in order to increase student achievement. This brief review of both literature and federal mandates that have impacted leadership within education in recent years is relevant to this research because it provides context for the evolved accountability in education and leadership necessary for implementing a change in curriculum process in order to better attain desired results.

In *The School Leader's Guide to Professional Learning Communities at Work* (as cited by DuFour, 2015), DuFour and DuFour (2012) cite the following as responsibilities of the principal:

- Clarify the purpose, vision, collective commitments, and goals that define your school.
- Create a culture that is simultaneously loose and tight, and clearly communicate the purpose and priorities of your school.
- Use the collaborative team as the fundamental structure of your school, and put systems in place to facilitate and support the collaborative team process.
- Ensure that students have access to a guaranteed and viable curriculum unit by unit.

- Monitor each student's learning through an ongoing assessment process that includes multiple team-developed common formative assessments.
- Provide every teacher and every team with access to ongoing evidence of student learning, and ensure they use that evidence to inform and improve their individual and collective practices.
- Provide students who struggle with additional time and support for learning in a way that is timely, directive, precise, and systematic, and provide students who are proficient with opportunities for extensions and enrichment.
- Demonstrate reciprocal accountability by providing staff members with the time, resources, and support that enable them to succeed at what you are asking them to do.
- Disperse leadership throughout the school, and build such a strong collaborative culture that those other leaders can continue the PLC journey long after you have left the school.
- Persevere in the face of obstacles and setbacks, and never lose faith that your efforts and the collective efforts of the staff can overcome those challenges and ultimately lead to higher levels of student achievement.
- Stay the course. (p. 246)

The role of the principal as the instructional leader in a professional learning community has continued to evolve through the age of accountability in education. The construct of instructional leadership, which situates the central responsibility of the principal as coordinating a schools instructional programming, first surfaced in the

1980's and evolved from the previously coined instructional management (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982). Instructional management was first defined in 1982 and situated the role of the principal around the management and coordination of the curriculum and instruction. When the idea of instructional leadership first surfaced, some questioned its congruence to school leadership (Barth, 1986; Cuban, 1984). However, the instructional management model, which has evolved into instructional leadership, continues to guide research and practice in education today (Hallinger, 2011). Instructional leadership has evolved as the preferred construct because of the reliance of the principal on expertise and influence over authority in making an impact on student learning and staff motivation (Hallinger, 2011).

Hallinger's (1982) Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) conceptual framework defined three essential functions within the role: defining the school mission, managing the instructional program, and developing the school learning climate program. Within the construct of the three dimensions, 10 functions of instructional leadership were identified. Of importance to this research, three functions of instructional leadership comprise the dimension of managing the instructional program: coordinating the curriculum, supervising and evaluating instruction, and monitoring student progress (Hallinger, 1982). The quality instruction that occurs within the classroom is linked to the quality of leadership that exists in a school (Harvard, Morgan, & Patrick, 2010).

Parallel to the shift from instructional management to instructional leadership, the release of *A Nation at Risk* (NCEE, 1983) was significant in creating reform in education in the United States. The report calls for the fact that,

All, regardless of race or class or economic status, are entitled to a fair chance and to the tools for developing their individual powers of mind and spirit to the utmost. This promise means that all children by virtue of their own efforts, competently guided, can hope to attain the mature and informed judgement needed to secure gainful employment, and to manage their own lives, thereby serving not only their own interests but also the progress of society itself. (NCEE, 1983)

The report was critical of the status of education in America, highlighting the trend of mediocrity and the potential impact on our nation (NCEE, 1893; Litchka, 2007). The report emphasized that our nation had lost touch of the basic purposes of schooling and congruently the high expectations and discipline needed; it emphasized the fact that those lacking skills, literacy, and training would be at a disadvantage not only from attaining material rewards that result from performance, “but also from the chance to participate fully in our national life” (NCEE, 1983).

Further, the report described educational excellence at the individual, school, and societal levels:

We define "excellence" to mean several related things. At the level of the *individual learner*, it means performing on the boundary of individual ability in ways that test and push back personal limits, in school and in the workplace. Excellence characterizes a *school or college* that sets high expectations and goals for all learners, then tries in every way possible to help students reach them. Excellence characterizes a *society* that has adopted these policies, for it will then be prepared through the education and skill of its people to respond to the

challenges of a rapidly changing world. Our Nation's people and its schools and colleges must be committed to achieving excellence in all these senses. (NCEE, 1983)

As a result of the report, the call for accountability increased, which has been demonstrated through the development of state and national standards in the areas of curriculum, assessment, and achievement. Pressure to improve education across all levels within all disciplines has resulted (Litchka, 2007). The report outlined indicators of risk that had been documented through testimony gathered by the Commission.

The findings within the report address the inadequacies in educational process within the following four areas: content, expectations, teaching, and time (NCEE, 1983). Because of concerns with the curriculum the commission compared patterns of courses students took from 1964-1969 to patterns present from 1976-1981. The report questioned the central purpose of curricula, extensive choice and large percentage of credits earned in areas outside of core academic areas. It also outlined expectations relevant to skills, knowledge, and abilities high school and college graduates should possess and dispositions essentially linked to student achievement. The report highlighted that expectations were communicated in many different ways. In reference to time the report concluded the following,

(1) compared to other nations, American students spend much less time on school work; (2) time spent in the classroom and on homework is often used ineffectively; and (3) schools are not doing enough to help students develop either the study skills required to use time well or the willingness to spend more time on school work. (NCEE, 1983)

Finally, the report detailed the following about teaching: not enough capable students were going into the field of teaching, teacher preparation programs had significant room for improvement, the professional work of teachers was not acceptable, and a shortage of teachers in many critical fields existed (NCEE, 1983).

The *Nation at Risk* report highlighted not only the significance of teacher preparation prior to joining the profession, but also the lack of productivity and professionalism teachers displayed once in the field. The inadequacies outlined in the report within the areas of content, expectations, teaching, and time supported the need for heightened management of the instructional program. The instructional program includes the interplay of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, but does not account for the human element as essential to drive the school improvement process.

Parallel to a shift toward accountability in schools in terms of curriculum, instruction, supervision, and achievement, a shift toward consideration of the human element of leadership was explored by Sergiovanni (1992) in *Moral Leadership: Getting to the Heart of School Improvement*. Within both the professional and moral sources of authority, the desired response from teachers comes from within rather than being imposed upon them; neither is management or leadership heavy. Professional authority assumes that the knowledge and expertise of the teacher is what counts most. The corresponding leadership strategy includes promoting dialogue around professional values and standards, requiring teachers to hold each other accountable for meeting standards, and making professional development opportunities available to teachers (Sergiovanni, 1992). Moral authority assumes that schools operate as professional learning communities, with teachers sharing in values, beliefs and commitments. Moral

leaders define the values and beliefs to be held at the center of the school as a community, create norms to govern behavior, and rely on members of the community to respond to duties and obligations. Moral leadership results in teachers responding “to shared commitments and felt interdependence” (p. 31).

As leadership continued to evolve as a construct in schools, standards for educational leadership were developed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) that outlined both expectations and roles of school administrators (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996). The intent of the document was to encourage communication about effective school leadership among stakeholders and to provide content that would lead to improvement in educational leadership within schools (CCSSO, 1996). The initial ISLLC document further explains effective leadership:

Effective school leaders are strong educators, anchoring their work on central issues of learning and teaching and school improvement. They are moral agents and social advocates for the children and the communities they serve. Finally, they make strong connections with other people, valuing and caring for others as individuals and as members of the educational community. (CCSSO, 1996)

The original six standards describe a school administrator as being an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by:

- Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community (Standard 1).

- Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth (Standard 2).
- Ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment (Standard 3).
- Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources (Standard 4).
- Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner (Standard 5).
- Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context (Standard 6). (CCSSO, 1996)

The Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (2015) replaced the ISLLC Standards (1996) to address leadership within the ever changing field of education. The new standards guide leadership in focusing on students achievement, innovation, and developing meaningful relationships as the foundation for all other efforts (PSEL, 2015). The standards have a clearer and stronger focus on student learning and the preparation of all students within the 21st century (PSEL, 2015). The standards, which communicate expectations and serve as a roadmap for educational leaders, address the following areas: (1) Mission, Vision, and Core Values, (2) Ethics and Professional Norms, (3) Equity and Cultural Responsiveness, (4) Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment, (5) Community of Care and Support for Students, (6) Professional Capacity of School Personnel, (7) Professional Community for Teachers and Staff, (8) Meaningful Engagement of Families and Community, (9) Operations and Management, and (10) School Improvement (PSEL,

2015). In addition to setting the foundation for educational leaders, the standards are currently used to guide principal preparation programs in supporting candidates in development of the skills, knowledge, dispositions, and characteristics needed in practice (PSEL, 2015).

While the ISLLC and now the PSEL standards have provided guidance for administrative leadership since 1996, accountability measures that were implemented as a result of federal support of education continued to surface. Another significant event occurred in January of 2002 when in the attempt to not only ensure accountability but also to increase federal support of education, President Bush signed the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)* on January 8. *NCLB* held schools and districts accountable for a successful educational experience for all students (Johnstone et al., 2009). The following were part of *NCLB* (2002): improving the academic achievement of economically disadvantaged, preparing, training and recruiting highly qualified teachers and principals, language instruction for limited English proficient and immigrant students, giving parents choice and creating innovative educational programs, making the education system accountable, making the system responsive to local need, helping all children learn to read, and helping children with disabilities. Although several indicators were used to determine if schools were in good standing under *NCLB*, the accountability measures connected to testing were widely recognized (Linn et al., 2002). Under *NCLB* (2002), states were required to set standards for achievement at each grade level and develop a system in order to monitor the progress of all students and subgroups in meeting the standards.

No Child Left Behind required a new approach to educational leadership in order to navigate elements such as standards-based curriculum, state testing systems, and school ratings based on student performance (Howard, 2005). During the time of heightened accountability, educational leaders began to grapple with not only the impact of leadership styles on schools but also with dilemma of choosing a style. Strong educational leaders have uncovered the benefit of combining the use of all leadership styles in order to see transformation in school districts. Holistic leadership allows for use of all leadership styles dependent on analysis of people, tasks, and environment. Successful leaders have the ability to situationally use the appropriate style or assign tasks based on preference of leadership style. Employing holistic leadership allows for use of all four styles dependent on the situation. Howard characterizes leadership styles into four types: Type A, fact based leadership, characterized by an emphasis on expectations of others to perform at a high level; Type B by a creative work environment in which suggestions and clarification are pervasive; Type C by making decisions based on feelings; Type D as highly structured, controlled and sequential (Howard, 2005).

Similarly, Marzano et al. (2005) summarizes the tenants of *situational leadership* as the leader adapting based on readiness and willingness of the followers. Four leadership styles are defined by the interaction of willingness and ability in reference to completing a task – telling style, participating style, selling style, and delegating style. Telling style occurs when the leader communicates direction without regard for personal relationships and the followers are not able or willing to perform a task. Participating style is characterized by friendly communication by the leader when providing specific direction and the followers being willing but unable to perform the task. The selling style

occurs when followers are able to perform a task but unwilling to do so, with a communication focus on persuading followers to perform the task and not on providing directions for completion of the task. Within the delegating style, the leader allows the followers the autonomy to complete the task on their own, providing little directions; the followers are both able and willing to complete the task (Marzano et al., 2005).

Kathleen Cotton reviewed 81 studies completed between 1985 and 2003 and published findings of her narrative review, identifying, “25 categories of principal behavior that positively affect the dependent variables of student achievement, student attitudes, teacher behaviors, and dropout rates” (as cited by Marzano et al., 2005, p. 24). Twenty-five categories within the areas of learning environment and climate, instructional leadership, support for teachers and students, and having a focus on learning were noted as a result of her review of literature. Whereas instructional leadership is explicitly identified as one of the categories of principal behavior Cotton noted, many of the other categories can be connected to the broad category of instructional leadership.

The American Educational Research Association issued a report by Leithwood and Riehl (2003) that yielded similar findings as Cotton’s narrative. Leithwood and Riehl defined educational leadership as, “those persons who provide direction and exert influence in order to achieve school goals” (p. 9). The report focused on application of research-based practices within the context of core competencies. Specifically, they identified building vision and setting direction, understanding and developing people, and redesigning the organization as the three competencies of successful leadership (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). Overlap exists across the competencies and the subskills (Daly, 2009). Leithwood and Riehl (2003) define building and setting direction as,

“helping a group develop shared understanding about the organization and its activities and goals that undergird a sense of purpose and vision” (p.17). Critical characteristics within this competency include setting a vision, focusing on common goals, and having high expectation for performance. The competency of developing people is developed through the leader intellectually stimulating, providing individual support through an understanding of personal needs, and modeling the values of the organization.

Redesigning the organization includes a focus on developing the school as an organization through creating shared norms, modifying organizational structures, and including collaborative processes throughout the organization (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003).

Inherent similarities exist when reviewing the 25 categories noted within the Cotton research and the three competencies identified by Leithwood and Riehl (2003). Many of the 25 categories outlined by Cotton fall under the broader competencies outlined by Leithwood and Riehl. Within both the Cotton review and the Leithwood and Riehl report, the importance of setting vision and developing people were cited. The categories of professional development, the norm of continuous improvement, and using student progress to improve instructional programming outlined within the Cotton narrative align to the Leithwood and Riehl competency of redesigning the organization.

Similar conclusions were the result of a meta-analysis of leadership completed by Marzano et al. (2005). As in the Leithwood and Riehl report, Marzano et al. (2005) presented specific responsibilities that lead to successful school leadership, “To great extent, our findings validate the opinions expressed by leadership theorists for decades. However, our 21 responsibilities provide some new insights into the nature of school

leadership” (p. 41). As a result of reviewing 69 studies that were completed and published from 1978-2001 as part of their research on principal leadership, they identified 21 responsibilities specific to educational leadership. The responsibilities can be categorized into the broader categories of instructional leadership, setting and maintaining culture, and managing situations, change, and relationships (Marzano et al., 2005).

Marzano et al. (2005) specifically identify knowledge of and involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment as responsibilities of the educational leader. Knowledge of and involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment are necessary in order to get to the improvement in instructional programming that was referenced within Cotton’s review. Leithwood and Riehl and Cotton cite collaboration as an important component of instructional leadership, while Marzano et al. include communication and relationships, elements central to collaborative efforts.

Shared leadership and culture were referenced within the work of Cotton, Leithwood and Riehl, and Marzano et al. Both constructs are central to the Professional Learning Community process that Sergiovanni (2005) cited as he studied Adlai E. Stevenson High School in Lincolnshire, Illinois, a pioneer school in implementing the Professional Learning Community process. He cites collective commitments as the important fact in making Stevenson the model school for PLC process.

The commitments of each of the constituent groups represents promises, and public promises at that. Teachers for example are telling students, administrators, and everyone else what they intend to do to implement the school’s vision. Since promises made must be promises kept, Stevenson is not only developing an

accountability system that is public, but a covenant of obligations that unities its various groups as a community of responsibility. (p. 60)

For schools implementing the Professional Learning Community process, the focus is not on what members of the organizations do but on how they think (DuFour, 2015). Leading staff to embrace the PLC process results in higher level of student achievement. Educators working as members of high functioning teams assert:

The assumptions, beliefs, expectations, and commitments of people in any organization shape the culture of that organization. The primary challenge in the PLC process is changing, and not merely tweaking, the existing culture. The best way to address the challenge is to engage the staff in building consensus regarding the four essential pillars of the PLC foundation – (1) shared mission, (2) vision, (3) collective commitments, and (4) goals – and then using that foundation to drive the daily work of the organization. (p. 100)

Whereas within schools that implement the PLC process, emphasis is placed on how the members of the organization think, accountability based on what is done is still a reality. Recent reform efforts that prepare students for college and career readiness are extensions of the *Nation at Risk* report that addressed inadequacies within the areas of content, expectations, teaching, and time in 1983. State leaders, through their membership in the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA Center) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) began to develop the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in 2009. The primary goal of the CCSS is to ensure that all students exit high school prepared for college, career, and life by implementing consistent learning goals across all states. Standard development was

informed by current standards, experts in the field, and public feedback and addressed the lack of standardization across states. The CCSS, along with a report validating the process and work of the committee, were officially released in June of 2010. States then undertook their own process for reviewing and adopting the standards. As of December 2013, 45 states had adopted the CCSS. As of August 2015, 42 states, the Department of Defense Education Activity, Washington D.C., Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the U.S. Virgin Islands have adopted the CCSS (retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/development-process/>). Three states that had previously adopted the CCSS have since withdrawn: Indiana, South Carolina, and Oklahoma (retrieved from <http://academicbenchmarks.com/common-core-state-adoption-map/>).

With the adoption of the CCSS, school leaders have the responsibility of leading staff through implementation. Eilers and D'Amico (2012) reference the following six essential elements as critical to the implementation of the CCSS: establishing purpose, setting priorities, aligning personnel with curricular needs, practicing professional discourse, encouraging risk taking, and providing feedback.

Eilers and D'Amico (2012) concluded the following:

These elements are the framework for actions that will enable school leaders to transform schools into learning communities where students are prepared for success in college and chose careers. Only skilled and principled leaders will facilitate the necessary changes in school personnel and climate required to establish more rigorous and robust schools. School leaders who embrace these

elements will be better equipped to move their colleagues from current beliefs and practices to new and uncharted territory. (p. 50)

Instructional leaders are tasked with not only aligning curriculum to the CCSS, but also more globally ensuring a guaranteed and viable curriculum. The same inadequacies that were outlined in the *Nation at Risk* report within the areas of content, expectations, teaching, and time are currently addressed when curriculum leadership is employed within the school's organizational structure and embedded within its mission. Knowledge of and involvement in the school's curriculum, instruction, and assessment are critical to principal leadership (Marzano et al., 2005).

Included within the review of relevant research on leadership are leadership theories that are applied within both a business and educational context. A common theme that emerged is that leadership style and practices vary and are largely dependent on situation and context. Included within the review of educational leadership is an account of major events that occurred within education over the course of the last fifty years as well as a review of leadership practices relevant to education. Best leadership practices cited by Marzano et al. (2005), Cotton (as cited by Marzano et al., 2005), and Leithwood and Riehl (2003) include being a change agent, setting vision, communication, providing professional development, and instructional leadership.

Additional research in support of the notion that leadership practice is dependent on context and situation is included within this review of relevant literature. Squires (2011) conducted a case study at a non-traditional high school for students at risk of not graduating, examining leadership practices. She used interviews, observations, and document analysis in order to explore how leadership was conceived and practiced. She

found that leadership at Lyons Big Picture School (LBPS) was fluid and shifted dependent on the situation. A variety of styles were employed by different individuals based on the situation. Leadership was both shared and distributed at LBPS, with transformational and shared leadership surfacing as styles employed (Squires, 2011).

In another study of leadership practices, Prater (2013) built upon previous research conducted by Avolio and Bass (as cited by Prater, 1993) as she studied three leadership styles employed by high school administrators on the Full Range Leadership Model (FRLM). She employed a cross sectional survey design in which she used *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (5x-Short)*, developed by Avolio and Bass (as cited by Prater, 1993), which was administered to 36 high school administrators and 784 teachers in two Middle Tennessee public school systems. Her findings were consistent with the findings of Avolio and Bass; transformational leadership was practiced most frequently by high school administrators, followed by active transactional leadership, and passive transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership, respectively. Administrators' responses to the survey did not reveal any significance in association between leadership style and outcome (Prater, 2013). Subsequent studies included within this review examine leadership practices employed by principals.

Perry (2013) conducted a qualitative study of high school principals in order to identify similar characteristics in principals that successfully led staff and students. Specifically, Perry used interviews to examine traits, values, commitment of successful high school principals, as well as preparation experiences of the principals and emotional coping mechanisms employed by the principals. The five principals identified for the purpose of this research were from public high schools and had served within the

capacity of their current positions for a minimum of three years. Six themes emerged from the research. Perry found that principals that participate in internship programs or have solid mentorship gain a solid foundation for effective principal leadership. Additionally, identified principals know the traits needed for effective leadership and have established networks to help them deal with educational change. Effective principals are committed to improving their practices, improving instructional capacity through relationships, communication and collaboration and see obstacles as challenges to lead staff through. Finally, effective principals rely on relationships, time management, and decision making to cope with emotional stress (Perry, 2013).

Of import within the area of educational leadership is a principal's ability to lead change efforts within the areas of curriculum, assessment, and instruction. Daniels (2009) studied the behaviors and efforts of elementary school principals as curricular change efforts were occurring within their schools. Daniels examined the link between leadership and professional development in helping staff understand and accept change within three schools in the same district. She conducted interviews of teachers and principals, observation of staff meetings, and analysis of documents used within the change process and concluded that strong principal leadership positively impacts the change process. Results also indicate that professional development contributes to a successful change initiative within a school. Themes emerged in connection to the role of the principal within professional development efforts. Motivating staff through setting vision, communicating with staff throughout the process, and providing staff with resources were cited as integral to the principal role in professional development. Additionally, the importance of data analysis related to the professional development and

the change initiative, the principal learning with the staff, and the principal facilitating professional development for staff also emerged (Daniels, 2009).

In similar fashion, Gaubatz (2012) studied six secondary science department chairs who navigated change attempts within their departments. She used interviews, document analysis, and leadership inventory to study leadership and change. In total, the department chairs referenced six instances of successful change and four instances of unsuccessful change. Research findings revealed that department chairs exhibited common leadership practices within different stages of the change process. Department chairs categorized their behaviors as task-oriented during the beginning and ending of the change process and people-oriented behaviors during the middle stages of the change process. Leadership inventory indicated similarities in leadership styles across department chairs, but also differences based on natural leadership style and context in which they were working. Gaubatz cited the following as themes that emerged from analysis of department chairs leading change, “an explicit focus on ‘doing what’s best for kids,’ the importance of teacher team construction, and the challenges of resistant teachers” (p. 116).

A review of both literature and federal mandates that have impacted leadership within education over the last 50 years is relevant to this research because it provides context for the evolved landscape, accountability, and best practices in education and leadership. These practices are necessary for implementing changes in order to better attain desired results. Specifically, the research of Alex Carter was replicated as the researcher explored best leadership practices for implementing change in curriculum

framework and process, situated within Kotter's framework. This is critical because of the central position of instructional leadership within the role of the principal.

Change

Models of Change/Modern Change Theory

As a construct of study, change is not only complex but also large in scope. Academics have studied change throughout time, resulting in the development of numerous models of change and theories of change being developed and applied in both business and education. It is of import to study change because reform, evolution, and innovation are part of the landscape when providing leadership in business and education. This review will focus on models of change and theories that have developed from the mid 1900's through the beginning of the 21st century. A review on change is important because the researcher studied secondary schools and districts that have navigated the process of changing framework for curriculum development. In *Leading in a Culture of Change* (2001), Michael Fullan, an expert in the field of organizational change primarily within the context of education, suggests:

CHANGE IS A DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD. ITS RELENTLESS pace these days runs us off our feet. Yet when things are unsettled, we can find new ways to move ahead and to create breakthroughs not possible in stagnant societies. If you ask people to brainstorm words to describe change, they come up with a mixture of negative and positive terms. On the one side, *fear, anxiety, loss, danger, panic*; on the other, *exhilaration, risk-taking, excitement, improvements, energizing*. For better or for worse, change arouses emotions, and when emotions intensify, leadership is key. (p. 1)

In studying leadership of the curricular change process, Kurt Lewin's *change model* is a foundational place to start because of the relevance to group decision making and also attention to the role that people and environment have on the change process. Kurt Lewin's change model has been identified as a foundational change theory. Lewin's work in both theory and practice made him one of the leaders in change theory during the 20th century and ultimately led to what is known today as a foundational change theory (Burns, 2004; Schein 1996). Lewin's model emphasizes consideration of the whole context in which the behavior takes place, including the people and the environment. Schein (1996) comments on Lewin's model,

the key, of course, was to see that human change, whether at the individual or group level, was a profound psychological dynamic process that involved painful unlearning without loss of ego identity and difficult relearning as one cognitively attempted to restructure one's thoughts, perceptions, feelings, and attitudes. (p. 27)

Lewin described change within the context of individuals and groups as being influenced by outside forces; differences between individual and group change were not included within Lewin's work (Burns, 2004). The change process is now referred to as Lewin's "force field analysis" (Harvey & Broyles, 2010, p. 16).

When two opposing forces are approximately equal, current behavior is maintained. For behavioral change to occur, the forces maintaining status quo must be overcome. This can be accomplished by increasing the forces for change, by weakening the forces for status quo, or by a combination of these actions. (Nelson & Quick, 1994, p. 560)

Kurt Lewin's change model consisted of unfreezing, changing or moving, and refreezing (Schein, 1996; Harvey & Broyles, 2010). The change process requires a disruption in the equilibrium; Lewin's process referenced the disruption as unfreezing (Schein, 1996; Burke, Lake, & Paine, 2009). Schein (1996) further describes unfreezing as the force field being altered in a way that the restraining forces were removed so that the driving forces could produce the change. Unfreezing that results in movement or change can only occur when individuals or groups of people believe they or the context can change (Harvey & Broyles, 2010). Within the scope of Lewin's work, the change agent is responsible for unfreezing, supporting movement or change through conveying the positive and attractive elements of the new place, and then facilitating refreezing within the new context in establishing a new equilibrium (Harvey & Broyles, 2010). Lewin's model of unfreezing, changing, and refreezing describes the central premise behind change. The concepts are incorporated within other change theories that are included within this review.

Central to executing a change within an organization is consideration of the professional learning and development necessary during the process of unfreezing, changing, and refreezing. Professional learning is of particular import when leading a school district through the process of changing its curriculum framework. While it is simple compared to more modern models being referenced today, *Kirkpatrick's model* provided a framework for measuring the success of a change that was implemented within an organization (Kirkpatrick, 1996). Kirkpatrick's four-level model, which dates back to 1959, provided a framework for evaluating training programs that are central to change. The four levels that make up the simplistic model are: reaction, learning,

behavior, and results. Reaction is based on participants' feeling about the training program. Reaction is important because participants will be more likely to engage in learning if they feel positive about a program. Learning involves an increase in knowledge or skills or an attempt to change attitude. Level three refers to the change of on-the-job behavior that results from the training. The fourth level refers to the results that occur as a result of the training. Kirkpatrick's model is of significance because of the inclusion of attention to not only individuals' feelings but the impact of the feelings on the learning that needs to occur in order to change behavior and shape results. The researcher studied the attitudes, professional learning experiences, behaviors, and implementation results of those individuals who were part of the process of shifting curriculum development processes within identified districts. Whereas many models exist in connection to the implementation of change within an organization, three of the most well-known are Kotter's eight step model for transforming organizations, Jick's ten-step model for implementing change, and General Electric's model for accelerating change (Mento, Jones, & Dirndorfer, 2002). All three models include multiple steps associated with implementing a change. Jick's ten-step model for implementing change and General Electric's model for accelerating change will be described within this review of literature; Kotter's eight step model for transforming organizations will be described in detail and will serve as a theoretical foundation for researching curricular change.

As referenced by Mento et al. (2002), *Jick's model* provides guidance for an organization going through major change. Jick developed his ten-step model in 1991 for use by organizations beginning the change process or evaluating the change process as it is in progress. The following are the 10 steps included within Jick's model: (1) analyze

the organization and the need for change, (2) create a shared vision and common direction, (3) separate from the past, (4) create a sense of urgency, (5) support a strong leader role, (6) line up political sponsorship, (7) craft an implementation plan, (8) develop enabling structures, (9) communicate, involve people, and be honest, and (10) reinforce and institutionalize the change. Many of the steps included within Jick's model parallel steps included within Kotter's model.

Jick states that implementation is a blend of both art and science. How a manager implements change is as important as what the change is. How well one does in implementing a particular change depends ultimately on the nature of the change, on how sensitive the implementers are to the voices in the organization, and on the recognition that change is a continuous, not a discrete process.

The following are steps in the *seven-step change acceleration model used by GE*: (1) leader behavior, (2) creating a shared need, (3) shaping a vision, (4) mobilizing commitment, (5) making change last, (6) monitoring progress, and (7) changing systems and structures (Mento et al., 2002). According to Mento et al., "the model focuses on the leader's role in creating urgency for the change, crafting and communicating the vision, leading the change, measuring the progress of the change along several dimensions, and institutionalizing the change" (p. 46). The seven-step model provides guidance as a checklist in order to ensure all steps are followed within the change process (Garvin, 2000). Again, steps are analogous to those included within Kotter's model, specifically creating a sense of urgency and developing a vision.

Mintzberg and Westley (1992) also highlight the importance of unfreezing in terms of executing organizational change. They note the importance of concrete changes

in order to get to the most conceptual, emphasizing the importance of changing people, systems, and structure in order to change culture; in similar fashion they stress the importance of making changes to facilities, programs, and positions in order to change vision. Mintzberg and Westley describe change in a series of moving circles: concentric, representing content and level of the change; circumferential, representing means and processes of change; tangential, representing the stages of change; and spiraling, representing sequences and patterns of change. Collectively, the circles create a framework for understanding change in an organization. When observing interactions within the framework of organization and strategy, changes occurring at the highest level should be highly integrated (Mintzberg & Westley, 1992).

Change process can, in other words, logically be cut off on their way up the scale but not down. Indeed, the problem with many mergers and restructurings, as well as with strategic planning in general, is that they often tend to reconceive at a higher level without redoing at a lower one – following through with the consequential actions. Thus, to change culture without changing structure, systems, and people, or vision without positions, programs, and facilities, would appear to constitute an empty gesture – a change in thinking without no change in action. At the very least, any effort to render broad change in an organization would seem to require some rather specific actions, if only to ‘unfreeze’ people to predispose them to new behaviors. (Mintzberg & Westley, 1992, p. 41).

Of particular importance to this research are the elements that Mintzberg and Westley (1992) include within the circumferential cycle, which suggest that an organization can move through the change process formally or informally; that change

can be initiated from any level of management or from non-management within an organization; from an internal or external source. They assert that because all change is new, the change must be learned and that, “a full process of change (at any level) proceeds through the steps of conceiving the change (learning), shifting the mindset (vision), and programming (where necessary) the consequences (planning)” (p. 44). Also of significance to the research are the stages of change embedded within the tangential cycle: development, stability, adaptation, struggle, and revolution and the patterns of change represented within the spiraling cycles: periodic bumps, oscillating shifts, life cycles, and regular process. Mintzberg and Westley highlight stages of change in a similar manner that other change theorists do, emphasizing stages of import to learning the change, shifting mindset, programming, and planning. Within this research, the researcher identified best leadership practices aligned to Kotter’s (2012) Eight-Stage process for creating a major change, many of which fall into the same categories identified by Mintzberg and Westley.

In examining the evolution of change theory since the mid 1950’s, the basic premise of unfreezing and refreezing is represented throughout time. Lewin discussed change within the context of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing (Schein, 1996; Harvey & Broyles, 2010); Kirkpatrick (1996) referenced reaction, learning, behavior, and results as of import to the training process; Mintzberg and Westley (1992) discussed change within the context of moving circle. The models endorsed by Jick and GE included multiple steps to reference when implementing a change, similar to the Kotter’s (2012) model which will be discussed in detail and which served as the theoretical framework for research.

When studying change in schools, research models that have originated within a business context are often included. The change theories that been described within this literature review are examples of those applied within the business and organizational context. Studying theorists that have applied their research within both business and education is important to this research because the work of Kotter (2012), which served as the theoretical framework for this research, has also been applied to both contexts. Similarly Jim Collins and Bolman and Deal have applied change research within both business and educational contexts.

Jim Collins, a student and teacher of leadership, has authored or co-authored six books, including *Good to Great* (2001). Collins completed both his bachelor's degree in mathematical science and his MBA at Stanford University. He then went on to begin his researching and teaching career at the Stanford Graduate School of Business and has since founded a management laboratory, located in Boulder, Colorado, where he completes research and dialogues with business executives. In addition to studying and teaching within the business sector, he has expanded his work to social sectors, including education. Within *Good to Great*, Collins asserts that "Good is the enemy of great. And that is one of the key reasons why we have so little that becomes great. We don't have great schools, principally because we have good schools" (p. 1). Collins' team defined good-to-great companies as those that went from achieving good to great results and then sustained the results for at least 15 years. The team started its research with a list of 1,435 companies that appeared on the Fortune 500 list and narrowed it to 11 companies. After identifying the 11 companies, the team selected comparison companies in order to identify the characteristics that the good-to-great companies had in common that

separated them from the comparison companies. They also identified companies that were a “direct comparison”; these companies were from similar industries and had similar resources but did not experience a good-to-great transition. In addition, “unsustained comparisons,” companies that did experience a good-to-great transition, but that could not sustain over time, were identified (Collins, 2001).

Collins’ (2001) research team completed in depth analysis of all 28 companies in order to yield the final framework, in which the concepts that are represented appeared in 100% of the good-to-great companies and in less than 30% of the comparison companies. Collins illustrates the transformation from good-to-great as a process of buildup followed by breakthrough. The process is then broken down into three stages – disciplined people, disciplined thought, and disciplined action. The stages are further broken down into key concepts: Level 5 leadership, first who then what, confront the brutal facts, hedgehog concept, culture of discipline, and technology accelerators. The “flywheel” wraps the entire process, representing that the process is continuous and involves relentless momentum-building (Collins, 2001).

The executives who lead companies through good-to-great transitions focused first on the “who” before the “what” (Collins, 2001, 41). Focusing initially on the “who” allows for an organization to more easily change its path, which is important because individuals are not on the bus because of the “what”. Additionally, if the initial focus is on the “who” then the leader should not have issues with motivation. Having a clear direction and vision absent of the right people will not result in having a great company. Good-to-great companies also exhibit rigorous cultures. Collins defines rigorous as,

“consistently applying exacting standards at all times and at all levels, especially in upper management” (p. 52).

Another theme that emerged from the research of Collins’ (2001) team is that good-to great transitions were built on a series of good decisions. Specifically, good-to-great companies confront the brutal facts of reality throughout the entire process. Embracing a culture in which people have the opportunity to be heard is also relevant in making a company great. They have the ability to lead in a way that allows for focus on the things that will make the biggest impact.

Collins’ (2001) team found that all of the executives that lead good-to-great companies were in some capacity hedgehogs. Collins’ team developed the Hedgehog Concept as a result of looking at the concepts that shaped the work of good-to-great companies in comparison to other companies. Good-to-great companies had deep understanding of the three dimensions that ultimately became the three circles that make up the Hedgehog Concept. The Hedgehog Concept is built around the intersection of following: *1 – What can you be the best in the world at, 2 – what are you deeply passionate about, 3 – what drives your economic engine* (Collins, 2001).

Good-to-great companies not only have a deep understanding of the concepts that make up the Hedgehog Concept, but also take disciplined action. Leadership within these companies gives people freedom and flexibility and manages the systems and not the people. Having the discipline to do whatever it takes to be the best is another characteristic of good-to-great companies. Additionally, good-to-great companies stay faithful to the Hedgehog Concept and to using the three circles to guide the work of the company (Collins, 2001). The flywheel, which wraps the entire good-to-great framework

and represents the momentum-building process that resulted in extraordinary results for the good to great companies, represents the feeling inside good-to-great companies as they were going through the transition from good to great. The flywheel is created because the other stages and concepts of the good-to-great framework are represented (Collins, 2001). The momentum-building that occurs within the flywheel is a distinction between the good-to-great companies and the comparison companies. In comparison companies, the flywheel did not consistently move in the same direction, but was often halted, redirected, or rerouted in a new direction (Collins, 2001).

A number of research studies have been done in the field of education using Collins' model. Lisa Zanglin (2011) studied the hiring practices of private and public schools through Collins' (2001) framework for human resource practices. She conducted qualitative research on four cases, two private schools and two public schools, exploring relationship between the practices embedded within Collins' framework and identifying effective teachers. Zanglin (2011) conducted interviews of principals and also completed a comprehensive document analysis of hiring practices and student achievement data. The purpose was to explore application of Collins' (2001) principles in identifying effective teachers. Related to human resources, the results did indicate that the hiring practices of both public and private schools identified effective teachers, although private schools also had the ability to remove the wrong people. This is consistent with Collins' Framework for getting the wrong people off of the bus. Additionally, findings revealed that private schools use internal professional development to grow leadership from within the organization and that financial compensation is not motivation for recruiting effective teachers (Zanglin, 2011).

In another example of using the *good great* framework, Laura LaChance (2007) investigated the indicators outlined by Collins (2001) through a quantitative study that included National Blue Ribbon Schools and comparable schools. LaChance (2007) used the Greatness Evaluation and Assessment Tool to assess principals and teachers on the indicators, with results illustrating the fact that none of the schools exhibited all of the good to great characteristics. Although, significant findings were confirmed within leadership and hiring practices, the Hedgehog concept, and in technology as an accelerator.

A model for organizational success that has been applied to change leadership in both business and education is Bolman and Deal's Four Frames (2008). Lee Bolman, an expert on leadership, management, as well as organization change, is an author, consultant, and lecturer. Bolman completed both his bachelor's degree in history and his Ph.D. in organizational behavior from Yale University. Bolman has co-authored several books, most with Terrance Deal, including *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership*. Most of Bolman's teaching and writing has been concentrated in the areas of leadership and organizations. Bolman is currently the Marion Bloch Missouri Chair in Leadership at the Henry W. Bloch School of Management at the University of Missouri-Kansas City. Prior to his time at UMKC, Bolman spent 20 years at Harvard, serving as the director of the National Center for Educational Leadership and the Harvard School Leadership Academy.

Bolman's writing partner Deal has developed expertise in educational leadership through practice, having served as a teacher, principal, administrator, as well as completing research as a professor. Deal earned his Ph.D. in Educational Administration

and Psychology from Stanford and held teaching positions at Harvard, Vanderbilt, and Stanford. Prior to retirement from the position, he most recently served as the Irving R. Melbo Clinical Professor of the University of Southern California's Rossier School of Education. Deal has authored or co-authored 20 books and over 100 articles on the topics of leadership, organizations, change, and culture. Through their application of both research and practice, Bolman and Deal (1984) identified four frames: human resources, structural, political, and symbolic. When used appropriately, framing can make a job easier; knowing how to leverage frames is critical. Moreover, when executing change, reframing, or breaking frames, is relevant.

In describing frames, we deliberately mix metaphors, referring to them as windows, maps, tools, lenses, orientations, filters, prisms, and perspectives, because all these images capture part of the idea we want to convey. A frame is a mental model – a set of ideas and assumptions – that you carry in your head to help you understand and negotiate a particular ‘territory’. (p. 11)

Change is more likely to succeed if a “multi-frame” approach is used (Bolman & Deal, 1999). The four frames are critical to understanding organizational change. Within each frame, assumptions about the change, barriers to successfully completing the change, and strategies for positively implanting the change are included.

The Human Resources frame focuses on the needs and skills of personnel. Change calls for an investment in training, although often times little money and time are dedicated to developing knowledge and skills, thus ensuring the change occurs in a positive way. When people do not feel confident then they feel anxious and resist the change (Bolman & Deal, 1999).

Within the Structural Frame, the structures of the system need to be in line with the new initiative. Structures and formal roles provide clarity in terms of expectations and formal duties. When engaging in change initiatives, structural items such as roles and relationships need to be formally or informally addressed (Bolman & Deal, 1999). Within a structural context, putting people in the right roles and relationships can address collective goals of the organization while taking into account individual differences (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Structure provides direction in terms of expectations and exchanges that occur and influence what happens within a workplace. Whereas structures are often hierarchical in nature, they can also be flexible.

Change causes conflict because some people support the change and some do not, with the conflict often occurring behind the scenes. When this happens, the change agents can give way to the status quo. Within a political context, conflict is a natural thing and positive outcomes can result if bargaining and negotiating become part of reaching agreement. Meshing new ideas into current practices is critically important to implementing a successful change. Because change results in conflict, forcing a divide, “Successful changes requires an ability to frame issues, build coalitions, and establish arenas in which disagreements can be forged into workable pacts” (Bolman & Deal, 1999, p. 9).

The Symbolic Frame connects to the fact that the meaning of something can be more significant than the reality of the situation. When symbols change in a workplace, common emotional responses are to embrace the past or rush into the future. Within the Symbolic Frame, turning to rituals is critical to working through significant change.

Rituals help individuals deal with change, let the past go, and move into the future (Bolman & Deal, 1999).

As part of a review of relevant literature, two research studies that used Bolman & Deal's *Four Frames* to examine the reframing of organizations were identified and reviewed. Each study examined leadership practices relevant to the *Four Frames*. For example, in a study of curricular change, Marcus Jorgensen (2014) used Bolman and Deal's frames when he studied the barriers to curricular change within general education mathematics. Specifically, he used a qualitative study to conduct research at a large public university in the Western United States. Interviews of faculty, staff, and administration were conducted. His analysis yielded 12 barriers that were grouped into four clusters: goals, control, quality, and communications. Jorgensen (2014) presented his findings in connection to Bolman and Deal's (2008) four frames, with a focus on potential barriers to change. Within the structural frame, the following barriers were shared as findings: (1) the goals of the curriculum were not agreed upon or articulated, (2) participants believed that the goals were being achieved, (3) the Mathematics Department defined quality within the curriculum and thus exercised quality control, (4) the department did not embrace the curricular change, (5) communication within the department had been a problem (Jorgensen, 2014). Math staff felt comfortable with the current curricular offerings and did not feel that curricular change was necessary. In terms of the symbolic frame, Jorgensen found that the math staff felt strongly about rigor within the curriculum and also held a strong belief in the traditional pathway previously followed. Resistance to curricular change could have been rooted in question about the rigor of the new pathway. Moreover, findings associated with the political frame

indicated that power within the department and the current process for making curricular decisions limited change. Finally, findings presented connected to the human resource frame reference culture and tension as barriers to change (Jorgensen, 2014).

JoAnn C.W.N. Wong-Kam (2012) also used Bolman and Deal's *Four Frames* as the framework for her qualitative study of a K-12 private school in Honolulu, Hawaii. She examined the structures of leadership, climate, and culture within the context of becoming an innovative school. The subjects in Wong-Kam's study included nine teachers that were identified as being representative of the school's faculty, and who were interviewed as part of the case study. Wong-Kam organized interview responses on leadership practices according to Bolman and Deal's *Four Frames*. The results of the study demonstrate that teachers value the role leaders, play in communicating vision and setting direction through the symbolic frame. The findings also represented the human resource frame as most represented, indicating value placed on relationship with leadership and needs being supported (Wong-Kam, 2012). In relationship to leadership practices categorized within structural frame, interviews yielded responses that highlighted the importance of managing schedules to promote collaboration, setting policies and procedures consistent with the human resource frame by gathering input from staff and clearly communicating initiatives, and allocating resources to support innovation. Within the political frame, responses indicated a perception of leadership associated leadership practices that are highlighted through not only the hiring or teachers, but also through teaching assignment, role, and team membership (Wong-Kam, 2012).

According to Bolman and Deal (2008), “the frames offer a checklist that change agents must recognize and respond to” (p. 393). When combined with the work of Kotter and his eight step change process, the frames become an integrated model. Kotter identifies an eight-stage process that summarizes the steps needed to undergo change in an organization. The eight steps are: establishing a sense of urgency, creating the guiding coalition, developing vision and strategy, communicating the change vision, empowering broad-based action, generating short-term wins, consolidating gains and producing more change, and anchoring new approaches in the culture (Kotter, 1996, 2012). Because change is difficult, the first four stages help to break down the current reality. Stages five to seven connect to the actual change and adjusted practices, while the final stage attaches to the change becoming part of the fabric of the culture of the organization. People often skip steps of the change process, move too quickly through the steps, or fail to continue to nurture earlier stages once they have moved on; all of which have an impact on the successful implementation of the change process.

Kotter (1996, 2012) asserts that successful changes go through all eight stages, with some operating in multiple phases at the same time. The stages are dynamic, not necessarily linear, and change leaders often have to cycle back through the stages when executing change (Bolman & Deal, 2008). People often skip steps because they are feeling pressure associated with the stage. Following a sequence other than the one recommended by Kotter rarely results in successful change because it feels forced and does not allow for the momentum-building that occurs within the recommended sequence (Kotter, 1996, 2012). All frames are not essential to each stage, but representation of all throughout the process is imperative for success (Bolman & Deal, 2008).

Finally, change creates loss of meaning for recipients of the change. Transition rituals, mourning the past, and celebrating the future help people let go of old attachments and embrace new ways of doing things. Kotter's model of successive change includes eight stages. Integrated with the frames, it offers a well-orchestrated, integrated design for responding to needs for participative learning, realignment, negotiation, and grieving. (p. 396).

Kotter describes management as processes that keep the organization running and leadership as processes that create an organization or play a role in changing the organization. When managers have not been taught or are not equipped to lead change are combined with a culture that does not always readily embrace change it can be detrimental. Change needs to be both managed and led, but only leadership can break through organizational challenges, motivate individuals, and embed the change within the culture of the organization (Kotter, 1996, 2012). Included within this segment of the review of relevant literature is an illustration of the development of both models and theories of change. Many of the models and theories included have been applied within both business and education. It is of import to study change because of its central position to providing leadership within both business and education. Specific to this research, the leading of major curricular change has been examined. Whereas many of the models and theories can be applied to business and education, it is imperative that the research reviews the landscape of educational change.

Educational Change

While the primary focus of the educational leader should be the learning, growth, and achievement of all students by ensuring quality curriculum, instruction and assessment practices within the school, the educational leader must also be an agent that has the ability to guide the organization through change. Current landscape within education results in change being ever-present in schools. An increase in accountability, evolution of trends and best practices within curriculum, assessment, and instruction, school culture, intervention, and constant monitoring of progress and results contribute to a culture of change being common in schools. A brief historical account for educational change over the last 50 years is included within this review of literature. In addition, modern theory and research on educational change is included. Finally, teachers' perception of change is addressed.

In the post-World War Two period, educators were perceived to have a large amount of professional autonomy. Parallel to the time that Sputnik was launched by the Soviet Union, education was perceived as a cause for problems within society and also a potential remedy (Johnson, 1999).

First, it was the lack of training in science and math. Then, it was the desegregation of schools. Then, it was the moral development of students. Then, it was drugs and student rights and dress codes and gangs and low test scores and handicapped students and learning-disabled students and non-English speaking students, etc. (p. 382)

Ironically, some of the “problems” that first surfaced in the post-World War Two period are still areas of focus for educational leaders present day. In the 1960's and

1970's, education change initiatives were left to experts within organizations to identify and implement (Goodson, 2001). This period was followed by external sources driving change in schools. Within the 1980's and 1990's, external controls began to drive change within schools, which resulted in reluctant change efforts. The 1983 *A Nation at Risk* (NCEE) report, which was published during the Regan administration, was significant in creating reform in education in the United States. The report was highly critical of the American education, emphasizing mediocrity and the negative impact on our country (NCEE, 1983; Litchka, 2007).

The shift to external sources driving the change resulted in internal agents being in position to respond to change; thus the need for change theory surfaced (Goodson, 2001). President Bush signed the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)* on January 8, 2001 in federal support of education and also in order to ensure accountability. Although NCLB is an example of an external source, the 2000's brought about a rebalancing of internal and external forces as initiators of change. This rebalancing caused for educational change to be seen as both going into the school and out from the school. Goodson asserts that educational change works best when teachers are personally committed to the reform and also supported in order to initiate the reform.

Johnson (1999) suggests that collaboration is often the answer to accountability. Collaboration is central to the Professional Learning Community process which is the best way lead a sustained cultural change (DuFour & Fullan, 2013). According to DuFour and Fullan, "leaders must grasp the underlying principles of PLCs and realize that changing culture in systemic ways is at the heart of any successful largescale

education reform” (p. 4). Systemic change requires purposeful implementation of a change process (Kotter, 1996; Fullan, 2001; Reeves, 2009).

In *Leading Change in Your Schools: How to Conquer Myths, Build Commitment, and Get Results*, Doug Reeves (2009), an expert in the field of educational change suggests:

Failure in change strategies need not be inevitable. In fact, it is avoidable if change leaders will balance their sense of urgency with a more thoughtful approach to implementing change. If we have learned anything about effective change in schools or any complex organization, it is that neither managerial imperatives nor inspirational speeches will be sufficient to move people and organizations from their entrenched positions. (p. 7)

Reeves’ assertion that failure within the change process is not an inevitable outcome substantiates the need to study not only the change process, but also the implementation of the change. The researcher used Kotter’s (1996, 2012) eight step change process as the theoretical framework for examining the change process as districts utilize new curriculum framework. Kotter includes establishing a sense of urgency as one of the eight stages within his process. Reeves, like Kotter, suggests that there are steps leaders can take in order to successfully implement a change initiative. At the beginning stages of implementing a change is examining what the organization can stop doing. Leadership shall also examine the readiness of themselves, individuals within the organization, and the organization as a whole prior to implementing the change. In order to execute a deep change in culture, leadership must also be able to communicate the elements that do not

change. With change, membership experiences loss, so sharing what is not changing becomes an integral part of the change process (Reeves, 2009).

Ritter (2013) used Reeve's four-stage change process as the conceptual framework for his research of principals within rural high schools implementing instructional change. Ritter used a multiple case study design as he interviewed principals from three rural high schools, an assistant superintendent from one school, and facilitating multiple focus groups with teachers from each of the three schools. Findings included themes emerging within each of the four stages within the model. Setting a vision, establishing goals, illustrating motivations for the change were highlighted as themes within creating conditions for change; using both data and collaborative approaches as well as addressing resistance and creating buy-in within planning for instructional change; implementation of vision and expectations, guiding staff, professional development, resources, and accountability within implementation of the change; and initial results as well as perception of sustainability within sustaining change (Ritter, 2013).

Michael Fullan, an authority on educational reform, is an author, consultant, and lecturer. Fullan, who advises policymakers and leaders in order to provide leadership in educational reform, received the Order of Canada distinction in 2012 and has received honorary doctorates from many universities. Fullan held a position at the University of Toronto in which he served as Dean of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). He partners with experts and governmental organizations around the world in order to support the learning of all children. Fullan has authored or co-authored more than 30 books on the topics of change, leadership, and culture. His research pertinent to

leading change in an educational setting will be outlined within this segment of the review of literature.

Fullan's (2001) Framework for Leadership is built around five components of effective leadership: moral purpose, understanding change, relationship building, and knowledge creation and sharing, and coherence making. According to Fullan, "there are strong reasons to believe that five components of leadership represent independent but mutual reinforcing forces for positive change" (p. 3). Similar to Reeves, Fullan suggests that when change brings on emotion, leadership is critical. Discussion of change naturally results in both positive and negative feelings, "On the one side, *fear, anxiety, loss, danger, panic*; on the other, *exhilaration, risk-taking, excitement, improvements, energizing*" (p. 1). In *Leading in a Culture of Change*, Fullan asserts that theory, knowledge, strategy, and ideas come together to aid in solving complex problems by creating a framework for thinking about and leading change.

Fullan (2001) suggests that leading in a culture of change requires a focus on changing the environment and not simply changing the individuals. Creating an environment that values a focus on learning and sharing the learning is critical. Fullan asserts that businesses are better at sharing knowledge than schools are. Additionally, schools could learn from businesses, especially considering the business of schools is teaching and learning. This notion further supports the rationale for using Kotter's model within this educational research.

When leading change, it is important to combat the implementation dip or gap (Goleman, 2000; Fullan, 2001; Reeves, 2009). Fullan (2001) asserts that when researching the change process in schools that an implementation dip is consistently

observed. The implementation dip connects to both performance and confidence and occurs when new skills or understandings are required as part of the change. In understanding the implementation dip, the leader recognizes a fear of the change and a lack of the skills needed to successfully implement the change.

Goleman (2000) contends that leaders need affiliative and coaching styles in order to make change work during an implementation dip. The affiliative leader plays on the emotion while the coaching leader focuses on building skills. According to Goleman, a coercive leader may have good ideas but cannot get others to buy into them. Goleman cites that the authoritative leaders can recognize the strengths and weaknesses in their approach.

In similar fashion to Kotter (1996, 2012), Reeves (2009) includes creating short-term wins as an implementation strategy. Creating short-term wins has the potential to mediate potential frustration with waiting for long-term benefits. Short-term results should also be communicated in order to reinforce effective practice and as an opportunity to adjust ineffective practices (Reeves, 2009). Making a compelling case for change aligns to the stage Kotter (1996) calls establishing a sense of urgency. Additionally, Reeves (2009) cites recognizing effective practices clearly throughout and emphasizing effectiveness as critical; each could be represented in multiple of Kotter's (1996) stages. Sustaining change and empowering membership are also addressed within identified change steps (Kotter, 1996; Reeves, 2009).

When describing the redefining of resistance, Fullan (2001) stresses that leaders often surround themselves with people that think in a similar way, although learning is more likely to occur when engaging with someone who disagrees. Those who have

opposing viewpoints have the potential to contribute ideas that may have been missed.

Also, involving resisters in dialogue will aid in implementation because it is easy to derail the implementation of change. Fullan defines reculturing as changing the way things are done and leading in a culture of change is not simply about the structure.

Fullan suggests that while using planning models is a good way to begin thinking about change that the reflection around the five core components of leadership allows for the process to be internalized in order to result in effective leadership during the time. This presents challenges because of pressure for leaders to provide direction and solutions.

The third component of effective leadership within Fullan's Framework (2001) explains relationship building within the context of moral purpose. Fullan shares that while businesses and schools have similarities that businesses could benefit from an increased focus on moral purpose, while schools could benefit from increasing "intellectual quality as they deepen their moral purpose" (p. 52). A continued focus on student learning through both school and district improvement lenses involves identifying both new ideas and strategies for developing the ideas, but successful implementation cannot result without a focus on relationships (Fullan, 2001). Again, this draws comparison between businesses and schools, further justifying the use of a change model that originated in business to research educational change.

The final component of effective leadership within Fullan's Framework (2001) is coherence making. Self-organizing and strange attractors are the two concepts that combine to form coherence making. Fullan suggests that self-organizing connects to relationships and actions that result as an interplay between the other components.

Coherence making occurs when leaders develop both conditions and processes first and

then direct them (Fullan, 2001). This is consistent with planning for change prior to implementation (Kotter, 1996; Reeves, 2009).

Rouse (2011) studied the role of the superintendent as an instructional leader in systemic change. Rouse used a combination of closed and open-ended questions within a survey in order to examine the characteristics, dispositions, and leadership styles and skills used by the superintendent as an instructional leader within the change process. Rouse, who used Fullan's leadership framework (2001) as the theoretical framework, received responses from 158 district superintendents. Rouse identified the characteristics that superintendents as instructional leaders model in order to build and develop collective capacity within the five components of Fullan's framework. The following seven themes of characteristics emerged across all five of the components: professional leadership, data-driven, action-oriented, systems or goal-oriented, instructional knowledge, stakeholder-minded, and group or team mentality. The following four themes emerged across all five of the components in regard to dispositions: values, collaborative, processes, and we versus I mentality. Rouse (2011) also found that inspirational, transformational, and coaching leadership styles were used across all five of the components 80% or more of the time and charismatic and situational leadership style across all five components 60-79% of the time.

Fullan (2008) suggests that the following are the keys to successful organizational change: love your employees, connect peers with purpose, capacity building prevails, learning is the work, transparency rules, and systems learn.

Joyce (2009) completed a comparative case study of the leadership attributes of public and charter school principals and student achievement. He utilized survey and

interview as he studied 18 principals from New Mexico; the principals represented public and charter schools as well as elementary, middle, and high school grade levels. Joyce used Fullan's (2008) six secrets of change as well as McRel's (Marzano et al., 2005) 21 leadership responsibilities as part of his theoretical framework. Results indicated that Fullan's attributes of loving your employees, capacity building prevails, learning is the work, and systems learn correlate to Marzano's responsibilities (Joyce, 2009). In addition, Joyce found that structure does matter, as the charter schools studied were more apt to make Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) than the public school studied. He also found that within this study grade level did not matter, nor was he able to correlate Marzano's responsibilities to student achievement (Joyce, 2009).

Similar to Kotter's Eight-Stage Process for creating a major change, in *Change Leader: Learning to Do What Matters Most*, Fullan (2011) describes a seven-part solution to the practical application of implementing change. The ability to generate energy and passion in others is at the core of becoming a change leader. Utilizing the individual elements of the framework is the simplistic part of practice, attending to the elements at the same time makes change leadership more complex. The synergy of applying the seven themes in combination is critical to being a change leader. Building the capacity within membership of the organization is also central. Commitment to staying the course and being empathic to those that oppose the change in the early stages is central to being resolute. Providing the platform for individuals within the organization to experience being more effective is an increased motivation for change (Fullan, 2011). Fullan highlights the following as imperative to developing a collaborative culture: focusing on a small number of goals, forming a guiding coalition,

aiming for collective capacity building while working on individual capacity building, and fostering an environment that benefits from collaborative competition. Change leaders learn confidently and navigate challenges without looking at them as failures. As they are learning, change leaders use data related to practice and outcomes in order to measure progress (Fullan, 2011).

Fullan's seven-part solution to implementing change is similar to Kotter's (1996, 2012) stages in construct and application. Within both frameworks, the organization often times operates within multiple stages at the same time, but it is the synergy of attending to all elements that results in leadership of successful change.

Four research studies that utilized Kotter's eight stage change process as framework for examining change within an educational setting are included within this section of the relevant literature review. These studies set the stage for the researcher to use Kotter's change process in order to examine shift in district-level curriculum framework. The studies examine programmatic change within an educational setting, curricular change, change in grading system, and an instructional change.

Basiratmand (2013) conducted a qualitative research study in which he explored the change process that Palm Beach Community College went through as it became Palm Beach State College and began offering bachelor's degree programs. Basiratmand used a collection of interviews, observations, and document analysis as he studied the transition. Results indicated that the change process was a success, with Kotter's framework being appropriate to study the organizational change process. Basiratmand found that the transition that Palm Beach went through aligned within all areas of Kotter's change model except the final stage, entrenching change within the culture. Basiratmand cited

low turnover as a potential reason for the old culture to permeate, but also acknowledged that alignment within this stage could occur in the future.

Turner (2014) studied the use of Kotter's eight-stage process as an intervention for creating major change in an elementary school context. The change model was implemented over a three-month period as a way to examine teachers' attitudes about the implementation of more rigorous teaching standards in order to achieve alignment with the Common Core. Turner's study indicated that using Kotter's change process did not yield statistically significant results relevant to using the process in accelerated fashion within this elementary school context.

From-Friesen (2013) completed a descriptive, mixed-methods design study in order to examine teacher and principal perceptions of the effectiveness of using Kotter's change model as an elementary district shifted instructional practices within Algebra 1. She also studied the strategies that teachers and principals perceived as most important in supporting the change process. In total, 21 principals and 20 teachers completed a quantitative survey and six of each principals and teachers participated in a qualitative interview. From-Friesen found that principals leading change within the area of instructional delivery benefitted from using Kotter's change steps. Specifically, findings indicated that empowering broad-based actions and communicating the change vision and strategy were the most effective of Kotter's change strategies within this context (From-Friesen, 2013). Within this research, Kotter's framework was used to examine transition in instructional practice.

Carter (2016) conducted a qualitative study in which he used Kotter's framework to examine the leadership of the transition from traditional model of grading and

reporting to a standards-based grading and reporting model. The 12 participants included seven middle school principals from six states and five high school principals from three states. The purpose of the research was to identify a set of best leadership practices that principals can apply when leading this type of transition within a middle school or high school, aligned to Kotter's framework. Participants completed two questionnaires in which they first identified 78 leadership practices essential to this type of transition within Kotter's framework for executing organizational change and then ranked practices on a Likert scale.

Results yielded a consensus of nine leadership best practices that principals should consider when leading a transition in grading and reporting from a traditional system to a standards-based system (Carter, 2016). The nine practices fell within five of Kotter's stages: establishing a sense of urgency, creating a guiding coalition, communicating the change vision, empowering broad-based action, and never let up. Within this research, Kotter's framework was used to study grading reform. Carter's research was replicated as the researcher used Kotter's framework to examine curricular change in order to identify leadership best practices and actions to guide instructional leaders when transitioning to a new curriculum framework.

This segment of the review of relevant literature on educational change included a brief historical account for educational change over the last 50 years and modern theory and research on educational change. Additionally, barriers to change and teachers' perceptions of change were addressed. Parallels were drawn between Kotter's eight step change model, a model primarily used within the business sector, and models implemented by experts in the field of educational change. Research that used Kotter's

change model as the theoretical framework was included in order to further justify using Kotter's model for this research. Attention to the change process is paramount when curricular change efforts are being implemented within schools.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The primary focus of the instructional leader within a district or school is the learning, achievement, and growth of all students. Ensuring high quality curriculum, assessment, and instruction is an essential component in achieving desired results. Instructional leadership, specifically within the areas of curriculum, assessment, and instruction, is a critical component to being an effective educational leader (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Marzano et al., 2005). The educational, and more specifically instructional leader, must also be able to guide a district or school through the organizational change process. In order to successfully implement a change, leadership must be attentive to the steps taken within the change process. Specifically, within the area of curriculum, changes are constantly occurring. Within this study, the researcher used Kotter's (1996, 2012) framework to identify specific best leadership practices and actions to guide instructional leaders through the change process of implementing a new curriculum framework.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study was to identify a set of best leadership practices and actions that instructional leaders can apply when leading a district through the transition to a new curriculum framework. The study replicates Carter's (2016) research, which utilized a qualitative design to examine best leadership practices that

principals can apply when leading the transition to standards-based grading and reporting models. Kotter's (1996, 2012) framework served as the theoretical framework and was used in a similar way that Carter (2016) utilized it in order to examine best practices and actions within the context of leading curricular change. This section provides an outline of the methodology for this research study.

Research Questions and Specific Details of the Study

The primary research question directed the study:

RQ1: What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as *best practices* when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

In replicating Carter's (2016) research, the primary research question, was designed to generate a broad list of possible best practices and specific leadership actions that instructional leaders can consider when leading change associated with adoption of a new curriculum framework. Research question one was answered by experienced participants, through completion of questionnaire one.

The participants were asked to answer the research question by identifying leadership actions and practices within the context of Kotter's (1996, 2012) eight-step framework for leading successful change within an organization. The eight steps are as follows:

- Establishing a sense of urgency
- Creating a guiding coalition
- Developing a vision and strategy
- Communicating the change vision

- Empowering employees for broad-based action
- Generating short-term wins
- Consolidating gains and producing more change
- Anchoring new approaches

In similar fashion to Carter's (2016) research, asking participants to offer leadership practices within the context of Kotter (1996, 2012) and based on their own experience and context, resulted in the data being organized and categorized for the second part of the study. As in Carter's (2016) study, *RQ1* was on the first questionnaire administered and was the singular question addressed within the first round of the study. From the first questionnaire, an array of leadership actions were identified and collected.

After the initial set of practices were identified and participants had the opportunity to review individual responses, the sample of instructional leaders ranked each action based upon interpretation of how critical the action is for successfully leading change efforts aligned to shifting district-level curriculum framework. This step assisted the researcher in answering the second question:

RQ2: Does consensus exist among experienced instructional leaders for the set, or subset, of practices discovered by the first research question?

In replicating Carter's (2016) work, the researcher followed similar steps that Carter followed throughout the course of the study. The first step in this research study was to identify the problem. Within the area of education, curriculum design, including framework, is always changing. Because of the nature of the constant change within the area of curriculum, instructional leaders need to be adept at leading such change within

schools and districts. This research has resulted in a list of leadership best practices to guide the work of secondary school instructional leaders when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development.

The next step in this research was to identify the experienced participants that would participate in the study. At the beginning of the study, the researcher aimed to identify a minimum of five and maximum of 24 secondary school or district administrators or department chairs that had successfully led a transition in curriculum framework. The sample of participants was identified through the CADCA membership list. The researcher used the list of secondary schools and districts to search public websites in order to identify specific individuals to send the initial invitation to participate (see Appendix A).

After identifying instructional leaders (Assistant Superintendents for Instruction, Directors of Curriculum, Principals, Associate or Assistant Principals, Directors of Data and Assessment, Directors of Special Education, and Division or Department Chairs), the researcher sent invitations to participate that confirmed qualification to participate, outlined steps of the research study, and described the response potential participants would need to take to confirm interest and consent to participate. Participants were deemed eligible if they have successfully led a secondary school or district through the process of changing curriculum framework. Specific criteria will be outlined when the invitation to participate is described within this chapter.

After experienced participants confirmed that they were willing to take part in the research study, they received the first questionnaire with directions outlining the process for the initial response collection. Participants outlined best practices and actions for

leading a change in curriculum framework, within the context of Kotter's change model. The initial questionnaire will be described in detail and included within the appendix (see Appendix B).

After participants completed the initial questionnaire, responses were coded in order to create the second questionnaire. Responses were coded using descriptive coding in order to identify and link comparable responses (Saldana, 2009). Within the coding protocol, words or phrases were identified in order to capture the essence of qualitative data collected through administration of questionnaire one. According to Saldana, descriptive coding is a protocol that can be utilized within all forms of qualitative research. Descriptive, or topic coding, is also favorable for beginning researchers that lack experience in coding. The researcher invited another researcher to participate in the coding process. The primary researcher identified a secondary researcher to be included within the coding process. The secondary researcher only had access to the responses to questionnaire one so that the secondary researcher could participate in the coding process and increase credibility. The secondary researcher only had access to a hard copy of the data set. The primary researcher ensured that the hard copy of the data was locked in a secure file cabinet when the secondary researcher was not engaging in direct data review. Once the coding process had been completed, the primary researcher retrieved the hard copy of the data and shredded it. The secondary researcher was only able to access the hard copy responses to questionnaire one when in the presence of the primary researcher in order to guarantee that the secondary researcher did not make a copy of the data. The secondary researcher had access to the data absent from contact information and/or information that would make participants identifiable. This part of the process ensured

credibility of the coding and allowed for comparison of the coding in order to confirm qualitative research findings that were gathered through questionnaire one and used to develop questionnaire two (Sutton & Austin, 2015).

In order to achieve inter-rater reliability, the primary researcher and the secondary researcher individually coded responses around key themes. Next, the researchers discussed their identified themes in order to come to consensus around naming and coding the best practices and actions that were included within the first round of responses. After responses were coded, participants had the opportunity to review their individual responses prior to the researcher combining all unique responses in development of the second questionnaire. This allowed for participants to confirm that responses were in fact representative of their original submissions. Once the confirmation process had occurred, the researcher combined all unique responses into the second questionnaire and participants went through the process of rating all unique leadership practices on a Likert scale. Following participants' rating the practices, statistical analysis was completed in order to identify best practices and actions for leading a change in curriculum framework that have resulted from this consensus building process. The second questionnaire will be described in detail.

Population and Sample

The target population for this research is secondary school administrators and department chairs who work in the Chicago Area. Specifically, the target population is instructional leaders that are involved with leading curriculum development, writing, revision, or implementation and have been involved in leading a transition in curriculum framework within the last five years. Therefore, solicitation efforts were geared towards

instructional leaders currently serving as secondary administrators and department chairs with job descriptions aligned to curriculum development and implementation efforts. Individuals with the following positions were considered for participation: Assistant Superintendents for Instruction, Directors of Curriculum, Directors of Data and Assessment, Principals, Associate or Assistant Principals, Directors of Special Education, and Division or Department Chairs.

Sampling Procedures

The sample of secondary instructional leaders that have led a district through the transition to a new curriculum framework were selected through a two-part process. First, the researcher utilized the list of schools and districts that are members of CADCA. The researcher used the list of secondary schools and districts to search public websites in order to identify specific individuals to send the initial invitation to participate. Sixty-four total districts that have at least one secondary school were active members of CADCA for the 2018-19 school year. Two districts were eliminated, City of Chicago School District 299, which has 175 total high schools, and Consolidated High School District 230, which has three high schools. City of Chicago School District 299 was eliminated because the researcher focused efforts on suburban schools. Consolidated High School District 230 was eliminated because the researcher is employed by the district and is currently serving as the principal at one of the three schools.

Of the 62 districts, 34 have one high school within the district, 16 have two high schools, four have three high schools, six have four high schools, one district has five high schools, and one has six high schools. Secondly, the researcher accessed websites in order to develop a list of administrators working within the area of curriculum

development and implementation (Assistant Superintendents for Instruction, Directors of Curriculum, Directors of Data and Assessment, Principals, Associate or Assistant Principals, Directors of Special Education, and Division or Department Chairs). An invitation outlining parameters for participation was sent to 283 potential participants on February 8, 2019. The invitation is included within the appendix (see Appendix A).

The research proposal outlined that a sample of no fewer than five current secondary school instructional leaders that have successfully led a transition in curriculum framework would be identified to serve as participants within the study. The initial list of individuals selected to receive the invitation to participate included individuals serving in instructional leadership positions within secondary schools and districts that belong to CADCA. Individuals identified as potential participants (N=283) received the invitation on February 8, 2019, outlining criteria for participation. Within this study, participants were deemed qualified if they work in instructional leadership positions, have led a secondary school or district through a change in framework for curriculum development within the last five years, and the school or district continued to use the framework or an enhanced version of the framework for at least one year after initial implementation.

The participant list was determined based on response to the invitation to participate in the research study. The invitation is located within the appendix (see Appendix A) and served as an agreement to participate, with confirmation through a follow-up email communication that was requested within the invitation. After participants made contact to confirm participation, they were sent questionnaire one through the Survey Monkey platform. After receiving the invitation to participate, 20

(N=20) individuals completed informed consent and confirmed participation via email response. Although questionnaire one was sent on February 18, 2019, prior to the two-week window closing, no additional invitees confirmed participation after questionnaire one was sent to participants. Originally, 20 (n=20) individuals chose to participate in the research study, completing informed consent, while at the study's conclusion a total of eleven participants completed all aspects of the research study. Participants were given two weeks to complete the round one questionnaire which was sent out on February 18, 2019; a reminder email was sent to those who had not yet completed the survey on February 25, 2019 when participants had one week left to complete the questionnaire. Fifteen (15) total participants completed questionnaire one before the two week window closed. Once the two week window had closed, round one data was coded and participants received their list of coded and consolidated responses. Responses were coded on March 8, 2019 and March 15, 2019.

Participants were sent their coded responses on March 17, 2019 and had two weeks to confirm that responses represented initial submissions or to provide the researcher with feedback if responses did not reflect intent of initial submissions. Participants that had not yet confirmed review, received an email reminder on March 24, 2019 that they had one week left to complete this part of the process and confirm review of list to the researcher. Once the process of confirmation and member checking had been completed, the round two questionnaire was created and sent to participants on April 1, 2019. Similar to the timeline within round one, participants had two weeks to complete the round two questionnaire, with a reminder email being sent to those who had not completed on April 8, 2019 when they had one week left to complete the

questionnaire. Questionnaire two closed on April 19, 2019 once the two week window had closed. Eleven (N=11) participants completed questionnaire two and the process of statistical analysis was initiated in order to identify the best leadership practices and actions for instructional leaders to use when leading a district or school through a change in curriculum framework.

Research Design - Delphi Method

In similar fashion to Carter's (2016) research, the Delphi method of conducting research was selected for this study. The Delphi method is a qualitative research method that is utilized for consensus building among experts in a particular field (Brady, 2015; Hsu & Sandford, 2007). Through the Delphi method, consensus is built by utilizing questionnaires to collect data from a group of expert participants (Brady, 2015). A unique characteristic of the Delphi method is that it is an iterative data collection process, which is informed by the responses of the expert participants (Hsu & Sandford, 2007). Data analysis within the Delphi method can be both qualitative and quantitative, as the type of data collected determines analysis (Warner, 2014). The methodology for the proposed research is in the form of Delphi method that includes qualitative and quantitative data analysis. Linstone and Turoff (2002) suggest quantitative techniques offer a deeper level of analysis of data gathered through Delphi.

Participant anonymity exists within the Delphi method and is one of the advantages. Additionally, the structure of distributing data to participants in a controlled fashion throughout the stages of the study, allows for participants' voices to be captured, carry equal weight, and be represented (Hsu & Sandford, 2007).

The first round of the Delphi process usually begins within an open-ended question to the expert participants about a given subject (Hsu & Sandford, 2007). Within this research, participants were asked the following question: What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as *best practices* when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development? They were asked to identify the practices within the context of Kotter's (1996, 2012) framework. Kotter's framework has been referenced as the theoretical framework for gathering the list of best leadership practices within the invitation to participate and then steps were described in detail within questionnaire one. Kotter's steps were defined for participants and the round one open ended question was asked within the context of each of Kotter's steps and participants were asked to respond eight times, identifying leadership practices that were used during the change process, aligned to Kotter's steps.

As mentioned and specific to this research, experienced participants gave qualitative input in order to respond to research question one (RQ1): What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as *best practices* when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development? Within the first round, participants provided qualitative feedback based on the question. The researcher then engaged in analyzing the data gathered through the first round and after participants had the opportunity to review coded responses, developed a second-round survey that is quantitative in nature. One common method utilized in the second round is a Likert scale (Linstone & Turoff, 2002; Warner, 2014). Data is then analyzed based on the definition of consensus that the researcher outlines within the study (Warner, 2014). Decisions and rules are determined by the researcher in

order to organize the responses of participants. Criteria used to determine consensus is based on the interpretation of the researcher (Hsu & Sandford, 2007).

Traditionally, within the second round of the Delphi method, participants are asked to complete a second questionnaire that is based off of the responses submitted through the first questionnaire (Hsu & Sandford, 2007). Within this research, participants had the opportunity to review the researcher's summary of their individual responses before questionnaire two was developed and distributed to participants for a second round of responses. Participants then received questionnaire two and rated each of the leadership best practices and actions, aligned to Kotter's framework (1996, 2012), on a Likert scale. Within this research, after participants completed the second questionnaire, statistical analysis of the participant feedback was completed in order to determine if a list of consensus best leadership practices had been identified by experienced participants. Within this this research, participants had an opportunity to rate leadership actions and practices from being not critical to implementing the change to being very critical to implementing the change.

Statistical group response is noted by Geist (2010) as one feature that helps to eliminate problems that can be present in qualitative research, such as influence and voice of participants carrying different weight. Statistical group response includes quantitative feedback that results from ratings of items using a survey. Geist suggests that ideas and opinions that surface within the research are ultimately outlined with ratings and descriptive statistics.

Time requirements can be an obstacle when conducting a Delphi study. Because a Delphi study is an iterative process, the response time of participants impacts the

analysis of the data, creation of subsequent questionnaires, and distribution of subsequent questionnaires to participants (Hsu & Sandford, 2007). A potential shortcoming to using the Delphi method is potential low response rate because of the iterative feedback process. Because it is an iterative process, the technique can also be time consuming for the researcher (Hsu & Sandford, 2007). Additional weaknesses outlined by Hsu and Sandford include, the potential for participants to conform opinions and potential for participants to elicit general statements, rather than specific statements that more knowledgeable and experienced participants may elicit. Because of the weaknesses associated with utilizing the Delphi method, the researcher imposed deadlines and timeframes throughout the course of the research study. Participants had two weeks to complete each step of the process throughout the course of the research and received email reminders at the one-week mark.

Data Collection and Instruments

Three instruments were utilized for data collection purposes: an invitation to participate, round one questionnaire, and round two questionnaire. The invitation to participate (see Appendix A) confirmed qualification of secondary school administrators to participate, outlined steps of the research study, and described the response potential participants would need to take to confirm interest in participation. Permission was granted from Carter (2016) to utilize his previously created questionnaire as the Round 1 questionnaire for this study. Similarly, Carter's framework for the round two questionnaire was utilized, with the addition of responses garnered within this research.

Within questionnaire one (see Appendix B), those participants that confirmed eligibility and agreed to participate, were asked to identify the leadership actions that

instructional leaders should consider as best leadership practices when navigating the process of changing curriculum framework, within the context of Kotter's (1996, 2012) eight step framework. As mentioned, participants had two weeks to complete questionnaire one. Upon receipt of participants' round one questionnaire, a complete list of unique responses was created and individual participants had the opportunity to review the researcher's summary of their responses prior to creating the round two questionnaire for distribution. Participants had two weeks to complete this process of review and confirmation. Fourteen (N=14) total participants confirmed responses during the two-week window and all fourteen confirmed that the researcher's coded responses captured the essence of their original responses. Unique responses of broad leadership best practices were then embedded within the round two questionnaire, again within the context of Kotter (1996, 2012). Questionnaire two was created based on responses to the first questionnaire, researcher review of the responses, participant confirmation that responses were reflective of original submission, and researcher organization of unique responses within the context of Kotter (1996, 2012). Questionnaire two included 120 unique practices and actions aligned to Kotter's steps and was sent to participants on April 1, 2019. The questionnaire included all unique responses gathered and illustrated the best leadership practices and actions aligned to Kotter's steps that were identified by experienced participants.

Data Analysis

The first round of data analysis occurred after the experienced participants engaged in identifying leadership practices and actions secondary instructional leaders should consider when leading the transition to a new curriculum framework. As

previously noted, experienced participants identified practices within the context of Kotter's (1996, 2012) framework.

After the initial data was collected from the first questionnaire, the experienced participants' responses were coded in order to develop the second questionnaire. The exact responses submitted within the first questionnaire were first copied into the second questionnaire, again aligned to Kotter's steps. Once the responses were categorized within Kotter, the responses were reviewed by the researcher so that similar and identical responses could be paraphrased, edited, and combined, resulting in suggested leadership actions to be included within the second questionnaire presented to the experienced participants (Davidson, 2013). Prior to developing the second questionnaire, individual participants were given an opportunity to review the list of their coded responses and confirm correctness with the researcher or provide additional insight. Within the communication sent to participants, they were provided their original responses and their coded responses. The researcher shared with participants that the analysis had attempted to create a synthesis of many responses into a set of leadership actions which the panel would rate for their importance to leading this type of change. If participants were in agreement with the coded responses and believed that the coded responses did not fundamentally change the essence of their input, they were instructed to simply reply "Looks good" to the email. If participants felt that the researcher missed the mark or could improve analysis, they were instructed to let the researcher know where she could improve her analysis and coding. It is important to note that all participants responded "Looks good" to the researcher.

As with Carter's (2016) research, this process shortened the data set so that responses that are unique within Kotter's (1996, 2012) eight-step framework are represented. This process represented member checking, in order to verify that the responses captured the essence of their submissions. Once the two-week window for confirmation of responses had ended, questionnaire number two was finalized and distributed for the second round of the Delphi study.

Once the second questionnaire was finalized, the participants were asked to complete the second questionnaire by rating all of the leadership actions included. They were asked to rate the leadership actions on a Likert scale. The scale, replicated from Carter's (2016) research, is as follow:

- A rating of 1 represents an action that is deemed not critical to the success of the change effort.
- A rating of 2 represents an action that is deemed somewhat critical to the success of the change effort.
- A rating of 3 represents an action that is deemed critical to the success of the change effort.
- A rating of 4 represents an action that is deemed very critical to the success of the change effort.

Carter's (2016) analysis was replicated within this research, as the results have been analyzed using multiple descriptive statistical methods. The analysis was conducted in order identify *best leadership practices* instructional leaders should consider when leading a school or district through a transition in curriculum framework. A literature review completed by Von der Gracht (2012) illustrated that many different types of

statistics can be used in order to reveal consensus, although, three were used in the case of this research. In Delphi studies, measures of central tendency and measures of dispersion are analyzed in conjunction (Von der Gracht, 2012). The mean was analyzed as the measure of central tendency and the interquartile range (IQR) was analyzed as the measure of dispersion.

Green's (1982) definition of consensus was used in part for the purpose of this research, resulting in defined consensus if 70% of participants rated a leadership practice three or higher on the Likert scale. Additionally, a minimum mean rating of 3.25 or higher was used to determine consensus. The third statistical indicator, an IQR of less than or equal to one, representing that more than 50% of responses fall within one point on the Likert scale, was also reviewed to determine consensus (Von der Gracht, 2012). The researcher used Von der Gracht's criteria as she defined "very high" consensus and "acceptable" consensus within her research. When analyzing the 120 coded leadership practices and actions, the researcher identified those practices and actions with an IQR of 0 as having "very high" consensus and those practices and actions with an IQR of 1 as having "acceptable" consensus. Further, Giannarou and Zervas's (2014) meta-analysis reinforces the fact that consensus can be defined in different ways by different researchers. Within their meta-analysis, various empirical research studies that utilized the Delphi technique were highlighted and the authors analyzed the numerous ways in which the Delphi technique was used to gain consensus. For the purpose of this research, an IQR of one reveals acceptable consensus while an IQR of zero indicates very high consensus (automatic). At the conclusion of the study, a position statement and final report will be produced and distributed.

Role of the Researcher

Within this study, the researcher facilitated a discussion of sorts among participants. Within this Delphi study, the discussion occurred electronically, and mostly through administration of questionnaires to experienced participants. The researcher had less direct contact with participants than in other forms of qualitative research that rely heavily on interviews and observations.

The researcher's experiences as a high school teacher, high school division chair, associate principal for instruction, and principal at the secondary level have all contributed to interest in the area of curriculum development and implementation. The researcher's professional pursuits in the area of curriculum and instruction, combined with a passion for studying leadership, specifically change leadership, helped further develop this topic for research. Additionally, the concept of identifying suggested best leadership practices for districts to leverage when experiencing a change in curriculum framework became of interest when the researcher's district of employment underwent such a transition. The topic, theoretical framework, and research design came together once the researcher discovered Carter's (2016) research and gained permission to replicate his study within the context of curriculum framework.

In regard to researcher bias, it was important that the researcher did not allow for preconceived thoughts about best practices in leading a shift in curriculum framework interfere with the research. The researcher places an inherent value on the curriculum process and understands the impact that implementation of a guaranteed and viable curriculum can have on student learning. Because the researcher has been intimately involved within the change process associated with implementation of a new district level

curriculum framework, the researcher kept a journal in order to limit bias. The journal was kept during the coding process as a means of acknowledging bias that the researcher may have. As stated previously, when conducting research, the researcher utilized member checking after coding the first round of responses in order to make sure that the essence of responses was captured in development of the second questionnaire.

Summary

Within secondary schools, change is a constant within the area of curriculum. In order to successfully implement a change within the area of curriculum, the instructional leader must be attentive to the change process. The researcher employed a qualitative Delphi study in order to identify specific best leadership practices instructional leaders should consider as they lead the change process of implementing a new curriculum framework. The best leadership practices and actions, aligned Kotter's Framework (1996, 2012), will be outlined and detailed within Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The methodology used for this research was discussed in Chapter III. Purpose, research questions, population, sampling procedures, research design, data collection, instruments, data analysis, and the role of the researcher were discussed in detail. Since descriptive statistics of the participants have been discussed in the previous chapter, this chapter introduces, summarizes, and presents the data results from evaluating the research questions for this study.

Methodology

A total of two questionnaires were administered and 11 participants completed all steps of the research process within the deadlines. The first questionnaire was an open-ended question; the round two questionnaire contained coded responses derived from the first questionnaire in which participants rated suggested best leadership actions and practices on a 1-4 Likert scale. The first questionnaire data consisted of open-ended responses aligned to each of Kotter's (1996, 2012) eight stages and one item which was included for participants to describe additional leadership actions that they did not feel aligned to any of Kotter's stages. The researcher replicated Carter's (2016) research and utilized a modified version of his instrument. The researcher modified the questionnaire so that it included background information on the study. The background information was also included within the invitation to participate and informed consent. The

researcher also included the primary research question that aligned to the study. The researcher used the same directions that Carter used and also the same description of Kotter's (1996, 2012) framework. The researcher designed and sent the survey within the Survey Monkey platform. The second questionnaire consisted of 120 coded leadership practice and action statements validated by study participants. Finally, the data were subjected to statistical analyses using the Delphi method in order to explore and describe the findings. A summary of the results and analysis associated with each research question are reported within this chapter.

The purpose of this study was to determine if a panel of experienced instructional leaders at the secondary school or district level could come to consensus on best practices and actions to consider when leading a school or district through a change in a curriculum framework. Experienced participants were able to gain consensus on the best practices and actions. The results indicate seven practices were identified as having very high consensus and 62 as having acceptable consensus.

Potential participation, interest, and qualification was sought from a list of instructional leaders working in schools that participate as members of the Chicago Area Directors of Curriculum and Assessment (CADCA) organization. The organization is a Midwest local high school organization comprised of individuals whose roles involve working with high school curriculum frameworks and curriculum change. The roles of the various individuals in the study were high school department chairs, high school assistant principals of curriculum and instruction, high school principals, and high school district administrators who engage in curriculum change. Not all participants are members of CADCA, but all participants work in schools that belong to CADCA.

Individuals identified as potential participants (N=283) received the invitation, outlining criteria for participation. Within this study, participants were deemed qualified if they work in instructional leadership positions, have led a secondary school or district through a change in framework for curriculum development within the last five years, and the school or district continued to use the framework or an enhanced version of the framework for at least one year after initial implementation.

Initially, 20 (n=20) individuals provided informed consent to participate in the research study. At the study's conclusion, a total of 11 (n=11) participants completed all aspects of the research study, meeting all deadlines. Participant and school/district demographic information can be viewed within the ensuing chart (see Table 1).

A total of two questionnaires were sent using an online tool called Survey Monkey. The first questionnaire (see Appendix B) included nine questions, including eight open-ended questions asking participants to identify the best leadership practices and actions aligned to each of Kotter's (1996, 2012) steps and one question which asked participants to list "other" practices and actions that do not fall into any of Kotter's steps. Questionnaire one, which was used to garner participant insight on leadership best practices and actions to consider when leading a change in curriculum framework, was a modified version of Carter's (2016) tool. The modifications included the addition of background information about the study and adjustment of the research question to align to the study on leading change in curriculum framework. The first questionnaire was sent to the initial twenty participants who indicated informed consent for participation. Fifteen (n=15) participants responded to questionnaire one with qualitative data describing their

Table 1

Participant and School/District Demographic Information

Participant	Role/School or District	Number of High Schools in District	Total number of students in school/district	Total number of certified staff in school/District	6-year Graduation Rate school/district	Rating 2019 School Report Card
1	Assistant Superintendent for Instruction / District	4	5,084 (Dist.)	306 (Dist.)	89.2% (Dist.)	Commendable (all schools)
2	Department Chair / School	2	2,147 (Schl.)	184 (Schl.)	97.1% (Schl.)	Commendable
3	Associate Principal, Instruction & Literacy / School	1	3,693 (Schl.)	250 (Schl.)	94.2 (Schl.)	Commendable (Schl.)
4	Assistant Principal / School	3	3,565 (Schl.)	253 (Schl.)	97.7% (Schl.)	Exemplary (Schl.)
5	Department Chair / School	1	2,708 (Schl.)	150 (Schl.)	90.4% (Schl.)	Commendable (Schl.)
6	Assistant Superintendent for Instruction/District	3	6,410 (Dist.)	419 (Dist.)	92.8% (Dist.)	Commendable (all schools)
7	Director of Data, Assessment, and Program Evaluation / District	1	9,353 (Dist.)	588 (Dist.)	90.8% (Dist.)	Commendable (Schl.)
8	Director of Special Education/District	1	3,811 (Dist.)	195 (Dist.)	95.1% (Dist.)	Commendable (Schl.)
9	Associate Principal for Instruction / School	1	3,757 (Schl.)	195 (Schl.)	95.1% (Schl.)	Commendable (Schl.)
10	Assistant Principal for Teaching and Learning / School	3	2,391 (Schl.)	130 (Schl.)	94.3% (Schl.)	Commendable (Schl.)
11	Director of Curriculum / District	1	9,353 (Dist.)	588 (Dist.)	90.8% (Dist.)	Commendable (Schl.)

beliefs about best practices and actions in leadership around a change in curriculum framework.

Next, the primary and secondary researchers analyzed the data collected through questionnaire one and coded the first round of data into generalized statements designed to synthesize participants ideas and responses. Participants then had the opportunity to review coded responses. Both the raw data and the coded data were sent back to the 15 participants (n=15) who completed the first survey. Participants received an electronic version of both their original data responses and the matching coded responses and were asked to validate that the coded data accurately and adequately captured the essence of their leadership change efforts while ensuring clarity and consistency. Fourteen (n = 14) out the fifteen participants validated the 120 coded data items quickly and responded without suggested edits to the coded language. It is of importance to note that all fourteen confirmed that the researcher's coded responses captured the essence of their original responses.

Finally, the 120 coded best leadership practices and actions were used to develop questionnaire two, which was quantitative in nature. Questionnaire two was sent to the remaining 14 participants. Eleven (n = 11) of the 14 participants completed questionnaire two, which included assessment of the 120 statements on a Likert scale. The Delphi technique was used to complete the final analysis of the 120 items to draw conclusions for this study.

Delphi technique studies are an ideal way to develop a synthesis of ideas and build consensus while maintaining confidentiality and minimizing time commitments from participants (Brady, 2015; Hsu & Sandford, 2007). This is because Delphi studies

can be conducted asynchronously and electronically, and therefore a panel of experienced individuals can easily participate in the study within the limits of their schedule and geographic location. The Delphi technique, as explained in Chapter III of this study, is used to determine if consensus can be achieved by experts while ensuring anonymity of responses and results in participants' voices carrying equal weight and being accurately represented within the findings (Hsu & Sandford, 2007).

Research Questions

Two research questions were addressed during the course of this study. These questions were generated from a thorough review of related literature and the researcher's knowledge and interest in this topic. The research questions addressed in this study were as follows:

RQ1: What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as *best practices* when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

RQ2: Does consensus exist among experienced instructional leaders for the set, or subset, of practices discovered by the first research question?

In an effort to answer Research Question 1, participants were asked the following question: What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development? Participants were provided basic definitions (Carter, 2016) of each of Kotter's (1996, 2012) eight stages and were asked to identify practices and actions specifically aligned to each step (see Table 1). Participants were provided space for open-ended, qualitative responses for each of Kotter's (1996, 2012) eight steps. The

descriptions of each of Kotter's steps was replicated from Carter's (2016) instrument. These qualitative data were coded into a total of 120 leadership actions. These 120 actions, validated by the experienced participants, informed the first research question. To answer Research Question 1, there are 120 practices and actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as *best practices* when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development. The qualitative raw data responses from each participant were coded, validated individually by each of the participants, and developed into a compiled list of 120 action items aligned to each of Kotter's (1996, 2012) eight steps. The 120 practices and actions were used to develop questionnaire two and served as the starting point for answering research question two.

Additional Input

In the round one survey, participants were also provided an opportunity to provide additional input. This open-ended statement was included at the end of the survey for participants to "list other best leadership practices and actions that do not fall into any of Kotter's steps." This was described to the participants prior to beginning the survey with the following statement: "I have included a space labeled 'other' for you should you think of action(s) that don't fall into any of Kotter's steps."

Additional Input	Please list OTHER best leadership practices and actions that do not fall into any of Kotter's steps.
------------------	--

Table 2

Kotter's Change Framework as Presented within Data Collection Instruments

Step Number	Kotter's Change Steps	Description included within questionnaire one
1	Establish a Sense of Urgency	Establish a Sense of Urgency: Actions that craft and use a significant opportunity as a means for exciting people to sign up to change their organization.
2	Creating a Guiding Coalition	Creating a Guiding Coalition: Actions taken to assemble a group with the power and energy to lead and support a collaborative change effort.
3	Develop a Change Vision	Develop a Change Vision: Actions to shape a vision to help steer the change effort and develop strategic initiatives to achieve that vision.
4	Communicate the Vision	Communicate the Vision for Buy-In: Actions designed to energize the people who are ready, willing, and urgent to drive change.
5	Empower Broad Based Action	Empower Broad Based Action: Actions that encourage change, remove obstacles to change, or change systems or structures that pose threats to the achievement of the vision.
6	Generate Short-Term Wins	Generate Short-Term Wins: Actions designed to produce, track, evaluate and celebrate volumes of small and large accomplishments - and correlate them to results.
7	Never Let Up	Never Let Up: Actions focused on increasing credibility to change systems, promote and develop employees who can implement the vision; reinvigorate the process with new projects, themes and volunteers.
8	Incorporate Change into the Culture	Incorporate Change into the Culture: Actions that make connections between the new behaviors and organizational success, and develop the means to ensure leadership development and succession.

To answer Research Question 2, three different statistics were used to determine consensus. Von de Gracht (2012) asserted that many different statistics can be used in order to determine consensus. Similarly, Giannarou and Zervas's (2014) meta-analysis reinforces the fact that consensus can be defined in different ways by different researchers as they highlighted various studies in which the Delphi technique was used to gain consensus through different statistical analysis.

As previously outlined in chapter three, Green's (1982) definition of consensus was used in part for the purpose of this research, resulting in defined consensus if 70% of participants rated a leadership practice three or higher on the Likert scale. Additionally, a minimum mean rating of 3.25 or higher was used to determine consensus. The third statistical indicator, an IQR of less than or equal to one, representing that more than 50% of responses fall within one point on the Likert scale, was also reviewed to determine consensus (Von der Gracht, 2012). The researcher used Von der Gracht's criteria and utilized the terminology "very high consensus" and "acceptable consensus" within this research. When analyzing the 120 coded leadership practices and actions, the researcher identified those practices and actions with an IQR of 0 as having "very high" consensus and those practices and actions with an IQR of 1 as having "acceptable" consensus. In summary, "acceptable" consensus was gained when 70% of participants rated a practice three or higher on the Likert scale, the minimum mean rating was 3.25 or higher, and the IQR was one. Very high consensus was established when 70% of participants rated a practice three or higher on the Likert scale, the minimum mean rating was 3.25 or higher, and the IQR was zero.

To answer Research Question 2, there are seven leadership practices experts in this study found to have “very high” consensus, while there are a total of 62 leadership practices that experts found to have “acceptable” consensus, with 56 actions aligned to Kotter’s 8 steps and six additional practices that fell into the “other best leadership practices and actions that do not fall into any of Kotter’s steps” category.

Kotter’s Step 1 - Round 1

Kotter’s (1996, 2012) step one revolves around establishing a sense of urgency. After reading through and coding all of the data, thirteen leadership actions emerged. One theme that emerged from the round 1 data was ensuring that the reason for change is clear. One participant response indicated a need for a “substantial reason to make the change.” This was illustrated throughout other participants’ responses in various ways. For example, another respondent indicated “clearly articulate the need for the change.” The idea of ensuring the reason for change was clear was depicted in various ways in the responses of other participants. In addition, numerous participants indicated the need to review performance data to establish a sense of urgency. For example, one participant stated it was important to “make the change with facts, data, and information.” Another respondent suggested the need to “audit the current reality by collecting and reviewing quantitative data as well as perception data to gather feedback from a representative group of stakeholders.” After all of the responses for Kotter’s Step one Establish a Sense of Urgency were coded and validated by the experienced participants, they were included within the round two questionnaire. In total, 13 key actions were added to the second-round questionnaire.

Kotter's Step 2 - Round 1

Kotter's (1996, 2012) second step "Creating a guiding coalition" was defined for participants as "Actions taken to assemble a group with the power and energy to lead and support a collaborative change effort" (Carter, 2016). Participants indicated the need to assemble a team of individuals to support the change. For example, one participant described the need to have a "core group of teachers committed to the change." In addition, diverse perspectives was a theme that emerged in many of the participants' initial responses. One participant stated "the most important actions when implementing change is to build consensus and momentum with a variety of constituencies." After all of the responses for Kotter's (1996, 2012) Step two Creating a Guiding Coalition were coded and validated, 11 key actions were added to the final survey.

Kotter's Step 3 - Round 1

Kotter's (1996, 2012) third step, Developing a Change Vision, was defined by Carter (2016) as "actions to share a vision to help steer the change effort and develop strategic initiative to achieve that vision." Several themes emerged from the participants' initial responses. One such theme was the creation of a team to lead the change. One participant explained that "a team should collaboratively create a vision and philosophy statement of the work." Another stated the importance of a "team committed to making the change happen." Another theme that emerged was to ensure there was a process to follow. One participant noted, "let those doing the work develop the process." While another response indicated the need "to develop key steps in the process." After all data were coded for themes throughout the initial 15 responses, 13 key action items were

developed and shared with the participants for validation. All participants supported the coded themes and the 13 actions were added to questionnaire two.

Kotter's Step 4 - Round 1

Kotter's (1996, 2012) fourth step "Communicating the Vision for Buy-In" was defined for participants as "Actions designed to energize the people who are ready, willing, and urgent to drive change" (Carter, 2016). Some of the themes that emerged from this data were various facets of communication such as: transparency, multiple methods, and consistency. Some open-ended responses from participants included all of these themes. For example, one participant stated the need to "communicate the vision frequently, succinctly, and embedded into everything you do." Another stated that the "development of a tiered and targeted communication plan must occur" and "those directly impacted must become aware first before the vision is communicated to the greater audience." The initial survey responses resulted in 11 key action statements for Kotter's (1996, 2012) Step four, which were sent to the fifteen respondents. All participants that responded validated the items with 100% support of the coded themes for the round two survey.

Kotter's Step 5 - Round 1

Kotter's (1996, 2012) Step five, Empowering Broad Based Action, was defined for participants as "Actions that encourage change, remove obstacles to change, or change systems or structures that pose threats to the achievement of the vision" (Carter, 2016). Numerous participants included responses which revolved around the theme of identification of obstacles to the change process. One participant noted the need to "identify policies and procedures that are in conflict with the change." Another

participant stated, “you must know the obstacles and barrier, name them, and commit to addressing them.” Another response included, “collect feedback about the change as a way to identify possible obstacles.” After all data were coded for themes and validated by experienced participants, 11 key action items emerged for Kotter’s (1996, 2012) Step five Empowering Broad Based actions and were included within questionnaire two.

Kotter’s Step 6 - Round 1

Kotter’s (1996, 2012) Step six, Generating Short Term Wins, was included in the round one survey with additional language to include “Actions designed to produce, track, evaluate and celebrate volumes of small and large accomplishments - and correlate them to results” (Carter, 2016). Participant data were analyzed to determine themes. One theme that resulted from numerous participants’ responses was to “establish short term goals and monitor progress.” One participant described the need to “celebrate student performance data,” while another participant suggested “celebrate the accomplishments of the organization and highlight progress.” Another theme that emerged while reviewing the coded data from round one was the need to “make adjustments as necessary.” Participant responses were coded from the following statements about making adjustments: “come up with a solution for each force against change,” “leaders should be quick to make adjustments,” and “anticipate and... make minor shifts and pivots to continue to move us towards the vision.” After all of Kotter’s Step six initial responses were coded, 13 leadership practices and actions emerged in the data. These 13 coded data were sent to participants to validate. All 13 coded responses were validated by participants and included in the round two survey.

Kotter's Step 7 - Round 1

Kotter's (1996, 2012) Step seven, Never Let Up, included the following language: "Actions focused on increasing credibility to change systems, promote and develop employees who can implement the vision; reinvigorate the process with new projects, themes, and volunteers" (Carter, 2016). The initial survey indicated numerous participants who valued the action to "stay focused on the desired outcome." This was evident through responses such as "be quick to reinforce the vision that was set forth," and "keep the focus visible with actions and interactions." Another response included, "[don't stray from the plan or] staff will lose focus." Finally, one participant emphasized, "Follow through with promises and obligations!" In addition, another theme was developed to state, "ensure leaders continually model change." This was evident from participants' statements. One participant shared, "as a leader I would teach each of the new courses the year it is first implemented...I was hopeful this would model for my staff that I was fully invested in the change and its success." Overall, there were 16 distinct practices and actions that emerged from the coded responses for Kotter's (1996, 2012) Step seven. All 16 actions were validated by participants and included in the round two survey.

Kotter's Step 8 - Round 1

Kotter's (1996, 2012) Step eight, Incorporate Change into the Culture, was defined for participants as "Actions focused on increasing credibility to change systems, promote and develop employees who can implement the vision; reinvigorate the process with new projects, themes and volunteers" (Carter, 2016). After initial responses were collected for the first survey, data were coded by themes which emerged from the

participants responses. For Kotter's Step eight, a clear theme that emerged was to "regularly communicate the vision to all members of the organization." Participation raw data responses included "explain the Why to all stakeholders" and "communication is key...in light of the goals and vision." One participant also offered a warning about lack of communication stating "if there is uncertainty about the vision being communicated by administration then things can easily derail." The responses to Kotter's Step eight were coded into 20 action items and sent to all participants to validate. All 20 action steps were validated by the participants and included in the second survey.

Other Insights - Round 1

In addition to Kotter's eight stages and descriptive language which was sent in the round one survey to participants, an additional space was provided for participants to "list OTHER best leadership practices and actions that do not fall into any of Kotter's steps." These data were coded for themes. One theme from coded responses was "provide sincere gratitude towards those that have engaged in the change." This was specifically stated by one individual and coded from another response that stated, "remember to say thank you at every turn." While another participant stated an important action was to "provide sincere gratitude for the efforts being put forth." These additional data were coded and resulted in 12 action steps. All 12 action steps were validated by participants and included in the second survey.

Round 2

After data were collected from the initial round, responses were clarified, summarized, and edited. The primary and secondary researchers worked together to develop themes and coded responses were sent to participants to validate. These

common responses, once validated by each participant, became the final 120 best leadership practices and actions to consider when leading change in curriculum framework. The items were included under each of Kotter's (1996, 2012) 8 steps within questionnaire two. The remaining 11 participants rated these 120 practices and actions on a 1-4 point Likert scale through their completion of survey two. This data was used to assess the group's rating of importance of each leadership practice or action, aligned to Kotter's eight steps for making substantial change. Additionally, the data was used to answer research question two and determine the practices that experienced participants reached acceptable or very high consensus for future consideration.

Kotter's Step 1 - Round 2

The analysis of Kotter's (1996, 2012) first step, Establishing a Sense of Urgency, indicated one action that had a very high consensus and three actions that had an acceptable consensus for leading change around a curriculum framework in secondary schools. The data validated through the Delphi analysis which indicated a very high consensus among respondents was a need to "communicate 'the why' and reason for change." This was the only very high consensus leadership best practice in Kotter's (1996, 2012) step one aggregate ratings, with a mean rating of 3.91, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 0. This made it the leadership action within Kotter's step one with the strongest support from this study's experienced participants. In addition, three other leadership actions emerged as acceptable consensus in the following order:

1. Collaboratively involve staff in the process with a mean of 3.73, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.

2. Collaboratively involve all stakeholders in the process with a mean of 3.27, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and an IQR of 1.
3. Identify standards and evaluation measures with a mean of 3.27, 82% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and an IQR of 1.

Table 3

Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level

Step 1: Establish a Sense of Urgency: Actions that craft and use a significant opportunity as a means for exciting people to sign up to change their organization.

	Mean	% 3/4	IQR	Consensus?
Communicate "the why" and reason for change	3.91	100	0	Yes
Collaboratively involve staff in the process	3.73	100	1	Yes
Collaboratively involve all stakeholders in the process	3.27	82	1	Yes
Identify standards and evaluation measures	3.27	82	1	Yes
Review student performance data	3.18	91	1	No
Communicate need for improved student achievement	3.09	82	1	No
Utilize research based practices	3.09	82	1	No
Review school performance data	3.09	73	2	No
Outline steps to the change process	2.91	91	0	No
Cultivate buy-in before taking action	2.73	45	2	No
Communicate state mandates relevant to the proposed change	2.64	64	1	No
Share societal expectations about the changes needed for educational systems	2.55	64	1	No
Share that students in common courses skills are varied	2.27	36	1	No

Kotter's Step 2 - Round 2

The analysis of Kotter's (1996, 2012) second step, Creating a Guiding Coalition, indicated one action that had a very high consensus and five actions that had an acceptable consensus for leading change around a curriculum framework in secondary schools. The data validated through the Delphi analysis which indicated a very high consensus among respondents was a need to "ensure team members stay committed to 'the why'." This was the only consensus leadership best practice in Kotter's (1996, 2012) step two aggregate ratings that met the criteria for very high consensus among respondents. The action "ensure team members stay committed to 'the why'" had a mean rating of 3.82, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 0. This leadership action was the action with the strongest support from experienced participants within Kotter's (2012) step two. In addition, five other leadership actions emerged as acceptable consensus in the following order:

1. Develop a team with diverse perspectives to support the change with a mean of 3.45, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
2. Allow for study, research, and implementation of practices with a mean rating of 3.36, 100% of participants rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
3. Work with team and re-evaluate as needed with a mean rating of 3.64, 100% of participants rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
4. Support team in implementation of change initiative with a mean rating of 3.64, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
5. Ensure team communication to other stakeholders with a mean rating of 3.36, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.

Table 4

Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level

Step 2: Creating a Guiding Coalition: Actions taken to assemble a group with the power and energy to lead and support a collaborative change effort that craft and use a significant opportunity as a means for exciting people to sign up to change their organization.

	Mean	% 3/4	IQR	Consensus?
Ensure team members stay committed to "the why"	3.82	100	0	Yes
Work with the team and re-evaluate as needed	3.64	100	1	Yes
Support team in implementation of change initiative	3.64	100	1	Yes
Develop a team with diverse perspectives to support the change	3.45	91	1	Yes
Allow for study, research, and implementation of practices	3.36	100	1	Yes
Ensure team communication to other stakeholders	3.36	91	1	Yes
Identify the readiness for change within the organization	2.91	73	1	No
Employ a research-based decision making strategy	2.73	64	1	No
Observe other programs, pilot, and analyze results	2.64	55	1	No
Have individual conversations to understand personal vision and beliefs of staff	2.55	45	1	No
Identify the exact parameters for change	2.36	36	1	No

Kotter's Step 3 - Round 2

The analysis of Kotter's (1996, 2012) third step, Developing a Change Vision, indicated two actions that had a very high consensus and nine actions that had an acceptable consensus for leading change around a curriculum framework in secondary schools. After completing data validation through the Delphi analysis, experienced participants gained very high consensus around the following two actions: "Select a leader capable of leading the change process" (3.82 mean rating, 100% of respondents

rating it a 3 or a 4, and IQR of 0) and “State the vision in terms of benefits for students” (3.91 mean rating, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and IQR of 0). These two leadership actions reflect very high consensus gained from respondents and reflect strongest support from experienced participants within Kotter’s (1996, 2012) step 3. In addition, nine other leadership actions emerged as acceptable consensus in the following order:

1. Ensure the change is reflective of organizational values with a mean of 3.73, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
2. Outline the specific action steps and desired outcomes with a mean rating of 3.36, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
3. Develop a team committed to the change process with a mean rating of 3.45, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
4. Remind everyone why the work needs to occur with a mean rating of 3.55, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
5. Ensure common language among members of the change process with a mean rating of 3.27, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
6. Provide opportunities for staff to inform the vision for change with a mean rating of 3.27, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
7. Ensure appropriate communication with a mean rating of 3.55, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
8. Remain focused on growth and improvement of outcomes with a mean rating of 3.45, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.

9. Allow team time to process ideas without judgement with a mean rating of 3.45, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.

Table 5

Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level

Step 3: Developing a Change Vision: Actions to shape a vision to help steer the change effort and develop strategic initiatives to achieve that vision.

	Mean	% 3/4	IQR	Consensus?
State the vision in terms of benefits for students	3.91	100	0	Yes
Select a leader capable of leading the change process	3.82	100	0	Yes
Ensure the change is reflective of organizational values	3.73	91	1	Yes
Ensure appropriate communication	3.55	100	1	Yes
Remind everyone why the work needs to occur	3.55	91	1	Yes
Remain focused on growth and improvement of outcomes	3.45	100	1	Yes
Allow team time to process ideas without judgement	3.45	100	1	Yes
Develop a team committed to the change process	3.45	91	1	Yes
Outline specific action steps and desired outcomes	3.36	91	1	Yes
Ensure common language among members of change process	3.27	100	1	Yes
Provide opportunities for staff to inform the vision for change	3.27	91	1	Yes
Envision the future with the change in place	3.09	91	0	No
Show alignment of curriculum development to strategic plan	3	82	0	No

Kotter's Step 4 - Round 2

The analysis of Kotter's (1996, 2012) fourth step, Communicating Vision for Buy-In, did not yield any actions within the very high consensus range, but after completing the Delphi study with 11 experienced participants, did reveal six actions that

had an acceptable consensus for leading change around a curriculum framework in secondary schools. The following six leadership actions landed in the acceptable consensus range:

1. State vision in terms of benefits to students with a mean of 3.64, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
2. Utilize a variety of communication methods with all stakeholders with a mean rating of 3.45, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
3. Ensure transparency in communication with a mean rating of 3.64, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
4. Ensure continual communication with a mean rating of 3.73, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
5. Model your expectations with a mean rating of 3.73, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
6. Provide opportunities for staff to participate in PD to gain perspective to the change process with a mean rating of 3.36, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.

Table 6

Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level

Step 4: Communicating Vision for Buy-In: Actions designed to energize the people who are ready, willing, and urgent to drive change.

	Mean	% 3/4	<i>IQR</i>	Consensus?
Ensure continual communication	3.73	100	1	Yes
Model your expectations	3.73	100	1	Yes
State vision in terms of benefit to students	3.64	100	1	Yes
Ensure transparency in communication	3.64	100	1	Yes
Utilize a variety of communication methods with all stakeholders	3.45	100	1	Yes
Provide opportunities for staff to participate in PD to gain perspective to the change process	3.36	91	1	Yes
Determine benchmarks and celebrate progress along the way	3.18	100	0	No
Allow opportunities for feedback and reflection from stakeholders to connect with the vision	3.18	82	1	No
Work with key stakeholders to study best-practices for implementation	3.18	91	1	No
Identify benefits and potential struggles	3.09	91	0	No
Start with a large group roll-out followed by small group processing	2.09	36	2	No

Kotter's Step 5 - Round 2

The analysis of Kotter's (1996, 2012) fifth step, Empowering Broad-Based Action, indicated one action that had a very high consensus and four actions that had an acceptable consensus for leading change around a curriculum framework in secondary schools. The data validated through the Delphi analysis which indicated a very high consensus among respondents was a need to "provide support and structure for those leading the change." This was the only consensus leadership best practice in Kotter's

(1996, 2012) step four aggregate ratings that met the criteria for very high consensus among respondents. The action “provide support and structure for those leading the change” had a mean rating of 3.82, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 0. This leadership action was the action with the strongest support from experienced participants within Kotter’s (1996, 2012) step five. In addition, four other leadership actions emerged as acceptable consensus in the following order:

1. Allow opportunities for individuals to be involved in the change process with a mean of 3.36, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
2. Identify obstacles that may impact change with a mean of 3.36, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
3. Identify key leaders with authority to make the change sustainable with a mean rating of 3.64, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
4. Provide opportunities for new leaders to emerge with a mean rating of 3.45, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.

Table 7

Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level

Step 5: Empowering Broad-Based Action: Actions that encourage change, remove obstacles to change, or change systems or structures that pose threats to the achievement of the vision.

	Mean	% 3/4	<i>IQR</i>	Consensus?
Provide support and structure for those leading the change	3.82	91	0	Yes
Identify key leaders with authority to make the change sustainable	3.64	100	1	Yes
Provide opportunities for new leaders to emerge	3.45	100	1	Yes
Allow opportunities for individuals to be involved in the change process	3.36	100	1	Yes
Identify obstacles that may impact change	3.36	100	1	Yes
Continually communicate and document change process	3.18	100	0	No
Provide critical feedback to those leading the change	3.18	82	1	No
Identify solutions to potential obstacles	3.09	91	0	No
Meet with resistors to address fears and concerns	3	73	2	No
Ensure the change process is at the forefront	2.82	82	0	No
Reward change agents	2.55	55	1	No

Kotter's Step 6 - Round 2

The analysis of Kotter's (1996, 2012) sixth step, Generating Short-Term Wins, indicated one action that had a very high consensus and seven actions that had an acceptable consensus for leading change around a curriculum framework in secondary schools. The data validated through the Delphi analysis which indicated a very high consensus among respondents was a need to "make adjustments as necessary." This was the only consensus leadership best practice in Kotter's (1996, 2012) step six aggregate ratings that met the criteria for very high consensus among respondents. The action

“make adjustments as necessary” had a mean rating of 3.91, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 0. This leadership action was the action with the strongest support from experienced participants within Kotter’s (2012) step 6. In addition, seven other leadership actions emerged as acceptable consensus within Kotter’s step six:

1. Establish short-term goals and monitor progress with a mean of 3.27, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
2. Communicate with all stakeholders with a mean of 3.45, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
3. Celebrate the accomplishments of the organization with a mean rating of 3.36, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
4. Share positive feedback from stakeholders with a mean rating of 3.27, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
5. Dedicate time for teachers to share their stories and showcase successes with a mean rating of mean rating of 3.36, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
6. She direct links between the work and its results and how the results link to student achievement with a mean rating of 3.64, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
7. Show gratitude to team members with a mean rating of 3.64, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.

Table 8

Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level

Step 6: Generating Short-Term Wins: Actions designed to produce, track, evaluate and celebrate volumes of small and large accomplishments - and correlate them to results.

	Mean	% 3/4	<i>IQR</i>	Consensus?
Make adjustments as necessary	3.91	100	0	Yes
Show direct links between the work and its results and how the results link to student achievement	3.64	100	1	Yes
Show gratitude to team members	3.64	91	1	Yes
Communicate with all stakeholders	3.45	100	1	Yes
Celebrate the accomplishments of the organization	3.36	91	1	Yes
Dedicate time for teachers to share their stories and showcase successes	3.36	91	1	Yes
Establish short-term goals and monitor progress	3.27	100	1	Yes
Share positive feedback from stakeholders	3.27	91	1	Yes
Consider both macro non-negotiables and micro team-level goals	3.18	100	0	No
Determine success metrics for the change process	2.91	82	0	No
Allow for cross-district communication around successes and failures	2.91	64	2	No
Make positive outcomes evident by piloting components of the change	2.55	64	1	No
Start with the easy work	1.55	9	1	No

Kotter's Step 7 - Round 2

The analysis of Kotter's (1996, 2012) seventh step, Never Letting Up, did not yield any actions within the very high consensus range, but after completing the Delphi study with 11 experienced participants, did reveal and 12 actions that had an acceptable consensus for leading change around a curriculum framework in secondary schools. The following twelve leadership actions landed in the acceptable consensus range:

1. Provide support and encouragement along the implementation journey with a mean of 3.64, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
2. Stay focused on the desired outcome with a mean of 3.64, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
3. Ensure leaders continually model change with a mean of 3.55, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
4. Ensure all stakeholders can articulate the change with a mean rating of 3.36, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
5. Build a community of trust with a mean rating of 3.73, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
6. Support innovative shifts and modifications to move the change along with a mean rating of 3.36, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
7. Celebrate wins to build excitement with a mean rating of 3.27, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
8. Recognize and acknowledge when things aren't working and adjust with a mean rating of 3.36, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
9. Maintain consistent messaging across all stakeholder groups with a mean rating of 3.36, 82% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
10. Look out for signs of implementation fatigue with a mean rating of 3.27, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.

11. Include professional learning as a means to encourage self-efficacy with a mean rating of 3.36, 82% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
12. Promote reflection on the progress that has been made with a mean rating of 3.36, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.

Table 9

Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level

Step 7: Never Let Up: Actions focused on increasing credibility to change systems, promote and develop employees who can implement the vision; reinvigorate the process with new projects, themes and volunteers.

	Mean	% 3/4	IQR	Consensus?
Build a community of trust	3.73	100	1	Yes
Provide support and encouragement along the implementation journey	3.64	100	1	Yes
Stay focused on the desired outcome	3.64	100	1	Yes
Ensure leaders continually model change	3.55	100	1	Yes
Conduct analysis and empower staff to determine improvement	3	91	0	No
Ensure all stakeholders can articulate the change	3.36	100	1	Yes
Support innovative shifts and modifications to move the change along	3.36	100	1	Yes
Recognize and acknowledge when things aren't working and adjust	3.36	100	1	Yes
Promote reflection on the progress that has been made	3.36	100	1	Yes
Maintain consistent messaging across all stakeholder groups	3.36	82	1	Yes
Include professional learning as a means to encourage self-efficacy	3.36	82	1	Yes
Celebrate wins to build excitement	3.27	100	1	Yes
Look out for signs of implementation fatigue	3.27	91	1	Yes

Help others feel an urgency to contribute	3	91	0	No
Recognize and acknowledge when things aren't working and adjust	3.36	100	1	Yes
Articulate individual roles and responsibilities of team members	2.91	82	0	No
Develop stages of the change so that various individuals can be involved	2.82	73	1	No
Maintain consistent messaging across all stakeholder groups	3.36	82	1	Yes
Look out for signs of implementation fatigue	3.27	91	1	Yes
Include professional learning as a means to encourage self-efficacy	3.36	82	1	Yes
Promote reflection on the progress that has been made	3.36	100	1	Yes

Kotter's Step 8 - Round 2

The analysis of Kotter's (1996, 2012) eighth step, Incorporating Change into the Culture, indicated one action that had a very high consensus and ten actions that had an acceptable consensus for leading change around a curriculum framework in secondary schools. The data validated through the Delphi analysis which indicated a very high consensus among respondents was a need to "focus on 'the why' behind the change." This was the only consensus leadership best practice in Kotter's (1996, 2012) step eight aggregate ratings that met the criteria for very high consensus among respondents. The action "focus on 'the why' behind the change" had a mean rating of 3.91, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 0. This leadership action was the action with the strongest support from experienced participants within Kotter's step 8. In addition, ten other leadership actions emerged as acceptable consensus within Kotter's step 8:

1. Develop trust among all stakeholders with a mean of 3.45, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
2. Make the change a priority and keep it in mind when making other decisions with a mean of 3.45, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
3. Involve multiple leaders so that the change leadership is not put on one person with a mean of 3.45, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
4. Ensure building administration feels supported by District Office and the BOE with a mean of 3.27, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
5. Allow for bottom-up change with key stakeholders with a mean of 3.27, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
6. Regularly communicate the vision to all members of the organization with a mean of 3.27, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
7. Provide professional development, including time to discuss the change and reflect on it with a mean of 3.45, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
8. Employ a mindset of continuous improvement with a mean of 3.73, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
9. Dedicate time for teachers to share their stories and showcase successes with a mean of 3.27, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.

10. Have students share the positive impact of the change on their learning with a mean of 3.27, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.

Table 10

Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level

Step 8: Incorporating Change into the Culture: Actions that make connections between the new behaviors and organizational success, and develop the means to ensure leadership development and succession.

	Mean	% ¾	IQR	Consensus?
Focus on "the why" behind the change	3.91	100	0	Yes
Employ a mindset of continuous improvement	3.73	100	1	Yes
Provide professional development, including time to discuss the change and reflect on it	3.45	100	1	Yes
Involve multiple leaders so that the change leadership is not put on one person	3.45	100	1	Yes
Develop trust among all stakeholders	3.45	91	1	Yes
Make the change a priority and keep it in mind when making other decisions	3.45	91	1	Yes
Ensure building administration feels supported by district office and the BOE	3.27	100	1	Yes
Regularly communicate the vision to all members of the organization	3.27	100	1	Yes
Dedicate time for teachers to share their stories and showcase successes	3.27	100	1	Yes
Allow for bottom-up change with key stakeholders	3.27	91	1	Yes
Have students share the positive impact of the change on their learning	3.27	91	1	Yes
Set an expectation for change within the culture by creating a cohesive team	3.18	91	1	No
Have a plan for assessing impact from the beginning	3.18	91	1	No
Focus on access and advocacy	3.18	82	1	No
Celebrate the accomplishments and recognize the set backs	3	91	0	No

Acknowledge efforts of guiding coalition and key staff	2.91	82	0	No
Implement change that impacts all students	2.73	55	2	No
Find a mantra that summarizes the change and make it a part of your brand	2.64	55	3	No
Make positive outcomes evident by piloting components of the change	2.55	64	1	No
Maintain creative tension in the system	2.36	45	1	No

Other Insights - Round 2

Within the first round of the Delphi study, experienced participants were asked the following open-ended question - What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development? In addition to listing the leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to each of Kotter's (1996, 2012) steps, they were asked to list best leadership practices and actions that do not fall into any of Kotter's (1996, 2012) steps within the category titled other. The analysis of the other category did not yield any actions within the very high consensus range, but after completing the Delphi study with 11 experienced participants, it did reveal six actions that had an acceptable consensus for leading change around a curriculum framework in secondary schools. The following six leadership actions landed in the acceptable consensus range:

1. Provide sincere gratitude toward those that have engaged in the change with a mean rating of 3.36, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
2. Admit and confront mistakes head on with a mean rating of 3.36, 91% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.

3. Continually review the data to keep “the why” in the forefront with a mean of 3.64, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
4. Ensure leaders continually model change with a mean of 3.45, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
5. Respond to staff needs during the process with a mean of 3.45, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.
6. Establish and maintain a positive and supportive atmosphere with a mean of 3.36, 100% of respondents rating it a 3 or a 4, and with an IQR of 1.

Table 11

Delphi Rating to Determine Consensus Level for Other Insights

	Mean	% 3/4	IQR	Consensus?
Continually review data to keep "the why" in the forefront	3.64	100	1	Yes
Ensure leaders continually model change	3.45	100	1	Yes
Respond to staff needs during the process	3.45	100	1	Yes
Establish and maintain a positive and supportive atmosphere	3.36	100	1	Yes
Provide sincere gratitude towards those that have engaged in the change	3.36	91	1	Yes
Admit and confront mistakes head on	3.36	91	1	Yes
Determine benchmarks and celebrate progress along the way	3.18	100	0	No
Review student performance data	3.18	91	1	No
Review school performance data	3.18	91	1	No
Share successes, both inside and outside the organization	3.18	91	1	No
Build trust, show empathy, and create a family-like environment	3.18	82	1	No
Build a network of colleagues outside of your organization that have experienced a similar change	3	82	0	No

Summary

The panel of 11 instructional leaders serving at the secondary school or district level met all qualifications for participation and completed all steps within the research. The experienced participants, a collection of department/division chairs, assistant/associate principals, principals, district level directors, and assistant superintendents came to consensus in identifying 69 best leadership practices and actions for instructional leaders to consider when implementing a change in curriculum framework. Seven practices were identified as having very high consensus and 62 as having acceptable consensus. The researcher's conclusions, discussion, and recommendations for future research will be discussed in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Within Chapter V, the researcher will discuss the findings and recommendations based on this research study. This chapter includes a discussion framed around the following sections: purpose of the study, research questions, and review of methodology, discussion/findings, and recommendations for future research, limitations, and a chapter summary. Leading change processes are integral to instructional leadership at the secondary level. Specifically, it is of import for those administrators and department chairs leading change in curriculum framework at the secondary level to be attentive to the steps critical to the implementation of the change process. It is also important to note that within the area of curriculum, change is constantly occurring. The researcher has aimed to address the gap in knowledge that existed within the area of leading the implementation of a new framework for curriculum development. Specifically, the research highlights best practices and actions that secondary instructional leaders should consider when implementing a new framework for curriculum development. Instructional leaders tasked with leading schools or districts through a transition in curriculum framework will be able to consult the findings from this research, outlined in chapter four and discussed in chapter five. The discussion will highlight the leadership practices and actions that experienced participants identified as best practices to consider when leading a school or district through the process of changing framework for

curriculum development. Specifically, discussion will emphasize the seven practices that were identified as having “very high” consensus.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative research study was to discover if a panel of experienced instructional leaders working at the secondary school or district level could come to consensus on best leadership practices and actions for leading a school or district through a change in curriculum framework. Within this context, Kotter’s (1996, 2012) eight stage change process was utilized as the theoretical framework. A qualitative methodology was employed by using the Delphi technique in order to build consensus around “very high” and “acceptable” leadership practices and actions for instructional leaders to consider when leading a successful change in curriculum framework. Once the panel of experienced participants was established, the researcher administered multiple questionnaires, provided an opportunity for participants to validate coded responses, and employed multiple descriptive statistics in order to determine consensus, specifically “very high” and “acceptable” consensus.

The researcher utilized a panel of experienced individuals within the field. Participant eligibility was based on educators holding instructional leadership positions, having successfully led a secondary school or district through a change in framework for curriculum development within the last five years, and contingent on the school or district continuing to use the framework or an enhanced version of the framework for at least one year after initial implementation.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study were as follows:

RQ1: What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as *best practices* when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

RQ2: Does consensus exist among experienced instructional leaders for the set, or subset, of practices discovered by the first research question?

Methodology

This research study contributes important new findings for administrators and department chairs working in instructional leadership positions in secondary schools. The findings of this study will support secondary school and district instructional leaders when implementing a change in curriculum framework. The respondents have anonymously built consensus around a set of best practices and actions for leaders to consider when leading a change in a curriculum framework. The practices, which have emerged as both “very high” and “acceptable” practices can be recommended to secondary school and district leaders as they implement a change in curriculum framework. Participants responded to the first questionnaire by sharing best leadership practices and actions, aligned to each of Kotter’s (1996, 2012) eight change steps. After validating coded responses, they then rated 120 practices on a four-point Likert scale, rating practices as not critical, somewhat critical, critical, or very critical to the success of the change effort (Carter, 2016). The researcher then used three statistics in order to determine and define consensus. It is important to note that in utilizing the Delphi

method, the researcher sets the definition of consensus; further consensus is defined in different ways by researchers (Giannarou & Zervas, 2014).

In part, Green's (1982) definition of consensus was used and resulted in defined consensus if 70% of participants rated a leadership practice three or higher on the Likert scale. The second statistic used to determine consensus was a minimum mean rating of 3.25 or higher. Finally, the third statistical indicator, an IQR of less than or equal to one, representing that more than 50% of responses fall within one point on the Likert scale, was also reviewed to determine consensus (Von der Gracht, 2012). Finally, Von der Gracht's criteria was used as the researcher defined "very high" consensus and "acceptable" consensus within the research. When analyzing the 120 coded leadership practices and actions, the researcher identified those practices and actions with an IQR of 0 as having "very high" consensus and those practices and actions with an IQR of 1 as having "acceptable" consensus.

Discussion/Findings

For instructional leaders, knowledge, understanding, and involvement in the secondary school's curriculum, instruction, and assessment are critical to a successful change in curriculum framework (Marzano et al., 2005). During a time of heightened accountability in schools across the nation, successful leaders must have the ability to lead staff not only in guaranteeing a viable curriculum for all students, but also have the ability to lead staff through steps and stages critical to change processes (DuFour, 2015). During change processes, oftentimes benefits are unknown and not realized right away; benefits can seem abstract and followers may lack confidence in the change because they cannot envision the future-focused outcome (Fullan, 2014). The leader is

responsible for working through the resistance to the change, helping members of the organization see the benefits of the change, and helping membership develop confidence in the change. According to Fullan, a change agent will be aware of feedback and act and respond in a timely fashion. Accordingly, being a change agent is one of the 21 leadership responsibilities that Marzano et al. (2005) highlight. This research study confirmed with “very high” consensus that in order to establish a change in curriculum framework, a leader must be capable of leading the change process. When a leader makes a decision to implement a new program, or in the case of this research, a new curriculum framework, the responsibility of change agent is being implemented (Marzano et. al., 2005).

The results of this study indicated a “very high” consensus for seven leadership practices and actions for secondary school and district leaders to consider when implementing a change in curriculum framework. The seven practices and actions for implementing a change in curriculum framework that participants identified with “very high” consensus are outlined in Table 12.

The seven “high consensus” practices aligned to six of Kotter’s (1996, 2012) eight steps. Experienced participants did not identify any “high consensus” practices under Step 4: *Communicating the Vision for Buy-In* or Step 7: *Never Let Up*. Further, in answering Research Question 2, participants reached “acceptable” consensus around 62 practices and actions. While 56 of these practices were aligned to Kotter’s (1996, 2012) eight stages, an additional six practices were identified by participants within the category labeled “Other.”

Table 12

Seven Practices/Actions Identified by Participants with High Consensus

Kotter's Step	Leadership Practices
Step 1 - Establish Sense of Urgency	Communicate “the why” and reason for change
Step 2 – Creating a Guiding Coalition	Ensure team members stay committed to “the why”
Step 3 – Creating a Change Vision	Select a leader capable of leading the change process State the vision in terms of benefits for students
Step 5 – Empower Broad Based Action	Provide support and structure for those leading the change
Step 6 – Generate Short-Term Wins	Make adjustments as necessary
Step 8 – Incorporate Change into the Culture	Focus on “the why” behind the change

The data indicated that particular attention should be placed on focusing on the why, identifying and supporting leadership, celebrating successes, showing gratitude for stakeholders impacted by the change process, adjusting when necessary, communicating throughout the change process, and involving multiple stakeholders. Within this chapter, the researcher will discuss the aforementioned themes that have emerged. The themes can serve as a road map for leading change in curriculum framework based on the seven practices that were rated “very high” consensus.

Theme Number 1: The Why

When instructional leaders are using the findings as a guide for implementing a change in curriculum framework, it is important to note that three of the seven practices within the “very high” consensus range are connected to “the why” of the change. The results indicated that experienced participants agree that it is important to communicate “the why”, that team members stay committed to “the why”, and that leaders focus on

“the why” behind the change. It is also important to note that of the 120 practices and actions that participants were asked to rate, only one action that included “the why” gained only an “acceptable” consensus and no practice that emphasized the importance of focusing on “the why” was left off the list of 72 practices that participants identified with either “very high” or “acceptable” consensus. This further emphasizes experienced participants’ perspective on the importance of focusing on “the why” when implementing a change, specifically when changing framework for curriculum development. This data aligns with experts in the field.

Experts in the field emphasize the importance of leading with, communicating, and staying committed to “the why.” Simon Sinek (2009) suggests that leaders who choose to inspire in order to motivate people follow the pattern that he calls the golden circle. The golden circle includes the following: why, how, and what. Sinek describes the why as being able to communicate the purpose, cause, and/or belief of what is done in an organization. According to Sinek, the most successful organizations start with the why, which leads to long term success and a combination of flexibility and innovation. Often times, sound decisions regarding changes are made by instructional leaders, but dialogue with stakeholders about why the changes are being implemented are limited (DeWitt, 2016). It is critical to discuss “the why” with stakeholders because they are often at the center of the change. In the case of changing framework for curriculum development, instructional leaders and teachers are central to implementation of the identified change. Most often, changes that are implemented are aligned to improvement efforts. Research within the area of improvement emphasizes focus. Identifying the problem(s) that leadership is trying to solve is critical and further justifies “the why”

(Bryk, Gomez, Grunow, & LeMahieu, 2016). When communicating “the why” associated with changing framework for curriculum development, leadership needs to consider current framework, the reason for change, problems associated with current framework, benefits of changing framework, research that supports the change and informs development, and impact that the change will have on the district or school, specifically the curricular, assessment, and instructional programming.

Theme Number 2: Selecting and Supporting Leadership

After experienced participants rated all practices and actions on the Likert Scale, two additional actions that emerged with very high consensus specifically connect to the individuals leading the change: Select a leader capable of leading the change (Step 3 Develop a Change Vision) and provide support and structure for those leading the change (Step 5 Empower Broad-Based Action). Additionally, five actions specific to leadership emerged with acceptable consensus after leaders participated in the Delphi study.

Specifically, within the area of leadership, consideration should be given to selection of the leader(s) and practices and actions that leaders can do when implementing the change process. The identification of these practices emphasizes the importance of selecting the right leader, supporting the leader, and considering the perspective of involving multiple leaders. A focus on developing many leaders that can work together during periods of change is more favorable than relying on one key individual (Fullan, 2011). It is also important to note that when change results in an emotional response by stakeholders, leadership is critical (Fullan, 2001). Additionally, it is important that building leaders feel supported by district leaders and the Board of Education. Selecting a leader capable of leading the change is central to the change process given the fact that the leader will

need to be focused on the implementation of best leadership practices and actions throughout the process; the change efforts could fall apart before they begin if the right leader is not driving the effort. In order to be able to select the right leaders for specific change efforts, organizations need to think about the development of leaders, which occurs on the job. Providing individuals with opportunities to develop their leadership skills and capacity could prove to be integral to leading future change efforts (Kotter, 1996, 2012). The implications of leadership within the process of changing framework for curriculum development, starts with selection of the right leader. The leader's ability to build a guiding coalition, share leadership, and empower other leaders is significant. The leadership team will need to develop a solid understanding of the relevant research, develop common language, and build capacity among team members. The leadership team will need to develop a plan for implementing the change process. They will need to pay particular attention to communicating "the why" for the change, involving stakeholders and planning for collaboration, and communicating throughout the change process. Leadership also needs to consider supporting staff through the change process. One of the ways that leaders can support staff through the change is by providing opportunities for professional learning and development. Teachers and instructional leaders that will be utilizing the framework for writing and revising curriculum need to understand the framework and how to use it to write high quality curriculum. Key leaders will need a solid understanding in order to support other stakeholders and empower broad based action.

Theme Number 3: Celebrating Successes

Something that leaders often lost sight of is the importance of celebrating and making the positive components of the change process visible. Kotter (1996, 2012) specifically notes that during the change process, positive feedback impacts both morale and motivation. Several actions identified within this research bring light to the importance of celebrating positive outcomes related to the change process. Whereas, many of the actions and practices that have been identified aligned to celebrating accomplishments and making positive elements of the change process visible are linked to Step 6 Generate Short-Term Wins, practices were also identified within two other steps. Change is difficult, so leaders should look for opportunities to celebrate with staff. Noting and celebrating short-term wins will give stakeholders indication that the sacrifices involved with the change process are worth it (Kotter, 1996, 2012). Within their account of their research, Amabile and Kramer (2011) describe the power that small wins and losses have on the people within an organization. They found that small events generally resulted in small reactions and big events generally resulted in big reactions. Although, they also found that at times, small events resulted in big reactions. Making short term wins visible and celebrating these wins will help leadership continue to build momentum around implementation of the new curriculum framework.

Theme Number 4: Showing Gratitude

In addition to making wins and positive aspects of the change visible, experienced participants also highlighted the importance of showing gratitude to stakeholders involved within the change process. The importance of showing gratitude for those involved with the change and being impacted by the change is another theme that

surfaced within the research. Within the Other category, participants identified *provide sincere gratitude toward those that have engaged in the change* with “acceptable consensus.” Leaders can show gratitude in other ways as well. *Show gratitude to team members* emerged with “acceptable” consensus within Step 6 Generate Short Term Wins. Experienced participants reached “acceptable” consensus when rating the following practices related to professional development - *provide opportunities for staff to participate in PD to gain perspective to the change process* and *provide professional development, including time to discuss the change and reflect on it*; providing professional development to stakeholders is another way to show gratitude and communicate that leadership values the stakeholders implementing the change. Within Step 7 Never Let Up, participants also achieved “acceptable” consensus when rating the practice *celebrate wins to build excitement* and when rating *dedicate time for teachers to share their stories and showcase successes* within Step 8 Incorporating Change into the Culture; celebrating wins is another way to show gratitude.

Theme Number 5: Adjust When Necessary

While it is important to celebrate positive aspects of implementing a change and to show gratitude for stakeholders, this research also highlights the importance of making adjustments within the change process when things are not working. In addition to *make adjustments as necessary* (Step 6 Generate Short-Term Wins) emerging as a “very high” consensus practice, additional practices emphasize the importance of making adjustments when working with the guiding coalition, the need to re-evaluate the change as needed, and being willing to adjust when things are not working. Making necessary adjustments within the change process is paramount to the success of any change effort.

Theme Number 6: Communication

Even though no leadership practices emerged with “very high” consensus within Step 4, Communicate Vision for Buy-In, six did emerge with “acceptable” consensus. When leading change in secondary schools, communication methods or lack of communication is a regular point of conversation among stakeholders. A lack of actions and practices within this area may be related to the complexities of communicating aspects of change within organizations and schools. Two of the practices that experienced participants noted with “very high” consensus referenced important communication points: communicate “the why” and reason for change (Step 1 Establish Sense of Urgency) and state the vision in terms of benefits to students (Step 3 Develop a Change Vision). Both of these “very high” consensus practices are related to communication even though they are not included within Step 4 Communicate Vision for Buy-In; this reinforces that experienced participants, value communication within the change process. Also, several other practices within multiple steps were identified with “acceptable” consensus and explicitly aligned to communication efforts. The data illustrates that communication is important throughout change processes and needs to be emphasized and nurtured throughout every step of the change process. The presence of practices and actions included within multiple steps reflects participants’ consensus around communication needing to be being a priority throughout the implementation of change processes in order for the result to be favorable. The absence of “very high” consensus practices within Step 4 Communicate Vision for Buy-In could be more related to the leader’s role in setting and communicating vision. Only two of the coded responses within step four referenced vision: *state vision in terms of benefit to students*

and allow opportunities for feedback and reflection from stakeholders to connect with the vision. Experienced participants identified *state vision in terms of benefit to students* with “acceptable consensus,” although it is important to note that the same practice was identified with “very high” consensus within Step 3 Develop the Change Vision. Identifying, developing, and communicating vision during change is an important aspect of change leadership. In order to implement a successful change, leaders cannot simply develop the change vision. Leaders must also communicate that vision to the stakeholders that are impacted by the change and involved with implementation of the change.

Amabile and Kramer’s (2011) research suggests that communication directly impacts implementation and completion of work. Their research can be applied when discussing the critical role that communication plays in the change process. They identify communication as a “climate force” (p. 109) that has an impact on the catalyst or inhibitor events that take place within an organization. In their research, they define a catalyst as, “anything that directly facilitates the timely, creative, high-quality completion of work” (p. 102). Conversely, “inhibitors hinder progress or cause setbacks” (p. 102). When looking at any change process, a lack of leadership actions or practices within the area of communication will undoubtedly negatively impact progress. With regard to communication efforts within a change process, leadership must prioritize ongoing and free-flowing communication, respectful and honest communication, and clarity. Focusing on the right aspects of communication is essential to coordinating and sustaining change efforts (Amabile & Kramer, 2011). Consideration regarding person or people communicating, mode of communication and timing is also important. This researcher

believes that communication is something that should occur throughout the change process. It is important that communication is not viewed as something that is only done on the front end of change.

Kotter (1996, 2012) offers that it is important to address inconsistencies in communication so that the credibility is not called into question. It is also important to note that two-way communication with stakeholders regarding the change effort is favorable (Kotter, 1996, 2012). The heavy emphasis on practices aligned to communication when leading a change in curriculum framework indicates that communication should be a priority for instructional leaders. When leading change efforts, the ability to communicate vision and strategy sets leaders apart from managers (Kotter, 1996, 2012).

Theme Number 7: Multiple Stakeholders

Another area of emphasis should be involving multiple stakeholders and making efforts collaborative. Even though none of the seven practices with “very high” consensus reference involvement of stakeholders and/or collaboration, many of the practices within the “acceptable” range do. These practices and actions are aligned to multiple steps within Kotter’s (1996, 2012) Framework. In fact, practices and actions related to stakeholder involvement and/or collaboration are included within each of Kotter’s steps and thus should be considered when leading a change within the area of curriculum framework. In similar fashion as communication, this highlights the importance of involving stakeholders and collaboration throughout the change process. Stakeholder involvement and collaboration directly impacts climate within an organization. Amabile and Kramer (2011) identified two climate forces related to

stakeholder input and collaboration that impact the catalyst or inhibitor events within an organization. Specifically, they identified “consideration for people and their ideas” and “coordination” (p. 109) as critical to shaping events that occur within an organization. The data collected within this research emphasizes that leaders need to prioritize stakeholder involvement and collaboration throughout the change process. The inclusion of stakeholders throughout the change process shows that leadership not only values their ideas but also respects them as individuals and honors their dignity as employees and people (Amabile & Kramer, 2011). Attention to the coordination of collaboration between individuals and groups should be prioritized. Within secondary schools, the Professional Learning Community structure allows for collaboration between and among individuals and groups. Leaders can utilize PLCs as the vehicle for garnering feedback and communicating updates. District and building level committees should also be intimately involved in change process. Employees’ skills and ability to implement the new framework must match the strategic plan. When focusing on the implementation of a new curriculum framework, not only is it important to have strong leaders in place, but teachers must be able to access the framework and understand it in order to write curriculum and implement it within the classroom.

It is important to note that Kotter’s (1996, 2012) steps do not have to be implemented in order, but that a leader should implement all steps if the desired result is leading a successful change process. This research has not only identified a collection of seven best practices that are available for secondary instructional leaders to use when leading change in framework used for curriculum development. Themes have also been identified and can serve as a roadmap for leading a school or district through the process

of changing curriculum framework. The themes can be implemented throughout the course of the change process.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings from this study are likely to be useful for instructional leaders executing a change in curriculum framework. Although, the findings are not necessarily a full list of practices and actions for leaders to consider within Kotter's Framework (1996, 2012) given that participants did not identify any practices within two of Kotter's steps. In order to supplement the findings of this research, future research could focus solely on the two steps that did not yield any practices or actions within the "very high" consensus range. Thus, subsequent research may result in a more complete list of best leadership practices and actions for instructional leaders to consider when changing framework for curriculum development. It is also important to note that participants' responses were coded after Questionnaire One was completed; additional specific and unique ideas may be of import to consider when implementing change in curriculum framework. Participants' responses to questionnaire one could also be used for future research. Individual participant responses were reviewed and coded; the coded responses were then included within questionnaire two. Future research could utilize all unique responses to questionnaire one; this would include many more unique responses but would also be a more complete list. It would be interesting to compare findings from the current research, in which the methodology included coding the responses before including in questionnaire two and future research in which the responses are not coded before being included within questionnaire two. Further, participants were asked to answer Research Question One within the context of Kotter's Framework, so additional

practices and actions, not aligned to Kotter's (1996, 2012) Steps, may need to be considered. Future research could include asking participants to answer both research questions without asking participants to answer within the context of Kotter's Framework. This open-ended approach could result in similar or different responses, more or less complete responses. This study could also be replicated by utilizing a different framework for incorporating successful change. Future research could also be completed by using the seven "very high" consensus practices that resulted and have participants identify additional practices and considerations that instructional leaders think are important aspects when implementing each of the seven.

Within the area of communication, future research could focus on asking leaders to highlight communication-related practices and actions that are synonymous with implementation of successful change processes within each of Kotter's (1996, 2012) Steps. Additional research within the area of communication could also include garnering stakeholder input on communication actions and practices that led to implementation of successful change. Future research could focus on leading a change in framework for curriculum development, but could also focus on implementation of any other change within the areas of curriculum, assessment, or instruction.

In similar fashion, future research could focus on involving multiple stakeholders and ensuring collaboration by asking leaders to highlight practices and actions that are implemented in order to involve multiple stakeholders and ensure the change process is collaborative. Additional research within the area of stakeholder involvement and collaboration could also include garnering stakeholder input on their involvement within the change process and specific actions and practices that led to implementation of

successful change. As with communication, future research could focus specifically on stakeholder involvement and collaboration when leading a change in framework for curriculum development, but could also focus on involvement during the implementation of any other change within the area of curriculum, assessment, or instruction.

Additional research may need to be conducted in order to provide guidance for implementing other types of change within schools, specifically within the instructional leadership realm. The methodology used in this study could be used to research best practices and actions for instructional leaders to consider when implementing other types of change within the areas of curriculum, assessment, and instruction. In the case of this study, the research replicated the research of Alexander Carter (2016) who used the framework to study leading change within the area of grading to a standards-based approach. In similar fashion, this research could be replicated within another area of instructional leadership. Additionally, the design and theoretical framework could be used to explore leading change within other areas within the field of education, resulting in further operationalizing Kotter's (1996, 2012) Framework for leading change in education.

Another opportunity for future research would be to identify participants based on their membership within the school community and expectations for implementing the identified change. It would be interesting to ask teachers to answer the research questions and identify best practices and actions for instructional leaders to consider when implementing a change in curriculum framework. This would be an interesting perspective because the teachers are the ones implementing this change. Further,

teachers could be the participants when future researchers use framework to identify practices and actions for consideration around any change within the field of education. When the researcher reviewed the narrative responses to Questionnaire 1, it became clear that issues/situations that leaders were currently working through or previously worked through impacted their responses. For example, one participant shared that it is critical that building leaders feel supported by the District Office and Board of Education. It can be inferred that the participant had worked through or was currently working through a situation in which he/she was either feeling strongly about the support received or lack of support received from the District Office and/or the Board of Education. Although research question one addressed the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as *best practices* when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development, some added reasons why the actions/practices should be done. When reviewing these responses, the researcher uncovered that participants were reflecting on leading previous change processes and sharing actions/practices that were not necessarily implemented; this led to the researcher learning about the actions/practices that should be implemented.

It is also important to note that while 15 participants completed Questionnaire 1, the biggest time commitment within the study, only 11 completed the review of coded responses and Questionnaire 2. The researcher believes that this could be the result of instructional leaders being overwhelmed with so many job responsibilities and with the intense time demands. There also could be an underlying response to a frustration with leading change processes and not wanting to engage with leading change as a participant within a research study.

Limitations

The study was conducted with the following limitations acknowledged:

- The researcher could have been limited on the number of experienced participants that qualified for the study based on the parameters outlined within the invitation.
- The researcher was limited on the total number of participants that committed to participation.
- The researcher used the limited list of secondary schools represented within CADCA and subsequently public websites to identify potential participants for the research.
- Because the Delphi method is an iterative process, the researcher was also limited by the number of participants retained throughout the course of the study. The Delphi design follows a format that uses multiple questionnaires throughout the duration of the study. Once potential participants were identified, they had to engage in multiple steps throughout the study: response to the invitation to participate based on qualification to participate and commitment, questionnaire one, review of individual responses to questionnaire one, and questionnaire two. Because of this iterative process, retaining participants was a limitation.
- Another limitation is that the list of consensus best practices that resulted from the research were derived solely based on the unique experiences that the instructional leaders had in implementing a successful change within the area of changing curriculum framework.

Summary

This research study was completed in an attempt to answer the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as *best practices* when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

RQ2: Does consensus exist among experienced instructional leaders for the set, or subset, of practices discovered by the first research question?

The researcher was able to answer the research questions at the conclusion of the study, as a result of employing the Delphi Method. Experienced participants were able to identify a set of consensus best leadership practices for secondary school instructional leaders to consider as they plan to lead a transition in curriculum framework at the school or district level. The experienced participants, identified through their employment at schools that participate as members of the Chicago Area Directors of Curriculum and Assessment, answered the initial open-ended questions included within Questionnaire 1 with an impressive level of detail. The participants hold a variety of instructional leadership positions, thus giving the researcher diverse perspectives that were represented within responses to Questionnaire 1. After the primary and secondary researchers coded the responses, all participants validated that coded responses were representative of their initial responses. The member checking that was employed after Questionnaire 1 validated the coding process that the researchers completed. Simple descriptive statistics were used to identify practices with very high and acceptable consensus. Seven practices were identified within the very high range and 62 within the acceptable range. The

results are accessible and can be easily referenced by any instructional leader that is leading a change in curriculum framework at the secondary school or district level. The results represent the beliefs of the 11 experienced participants that completed all steps within the research study. The data indicated that particular attention should be placed on the communication plan, involving multiple stakeholders, identifying the right leaders, focusing on the why, celebrating successes, supporting staff throughout the change process, and showing gratitude to stakeholders implementing the change.

The Delphi method is a method that can be employed in order to reach consensus around a given topic. This is a method that was used in order to distribute voice equally within the study and so that the participants could participate within their own schedule constraints. The results of this study can be used to guide instructional leaders through the process of changing curriculum framework. This study can be replicated in order to garner information from experienced participants on the implementation of any type of change. This study affirms that there are best practices for instructional leaders to consider when implementing change in curriculum framework and also serves as a guide for leaders that want to gain consensus around leading other types of change in order to ensure that critical practices and actions are considered.

APPENDIX A
INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT
AND INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Educational Leader,

Attached you will find an invitation to participate in a research project entitled Best Practices for Leading a Transition in Curriculum Framework in Secondary Schools. This research study is being completed for partial fulfillment of the requirements of obtaining a Doctorate of Education through Loyola University.

In order to conduct this research, I am in the process of recruiting a minimum of five current secondary school administrators or department chairs, specifically those holding instructional leadership positions, who have successfully led a school or district through a change in curriculum framework.

I am in the beginning stages of developing a list of experienced individuals to participate in this project. Criteria for participation, research methodology, and procedures are detailed within the attached invitation. By participating in this study, you will help identify a set of consensus best practices that school leaders could consider when contemplating leading a school or district in changing framework for curriculum development. Experienced participants have been identified based on being an administrator or department chair, working in an instructional leadership position, within a secondary district or school that is a member of the Chicago Area Directors of Curriculum and Assessment (CADCA) organization.

This study will use a Delphi technique, which is a series of web-based questionnaires designed to identify consensus around a set of important leadership actions that future school leaders could consider when leading this type of change effort. Participants will complete a series of electronic questionnaires/communications and will remain unidentifiable to other participants. Procedures are detailed within the attached invitation.

Decision to participate will have no impact on current relationship with either the researcher or CADCA. As this study is completely voluntary, you will be free to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty.

Thank you for considering participating in my study. If you qualify based on the outlined criteria included within the invitation and are willing to participate in this study, please complete the statement of consent within the attachment and return to jtyrrell@luc.edu. Please return the attachment within two weeks in order to confirm participation.

I would greatly appreciate your contribution as an educational leader in this important study.

Thank you very much for your consideration,
Jennifer Tyrrell, Principal
Carl Sandburg High School
Doctoral Candidate, Loyola University

Consent to Participate in Research

Research Project Title: Best Leadership Practices and Actions for Leading a Transition in Curriculum Framework in Secondary Schools
Researcher: Jennifer Tyrrell
Faculty Sponsor: Brigid Schultz

You are being asked to take part in a research study being conducted by Jennifer Tyrrell for a dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Brigid Schultz in the Department of Educational Leadership at Loyola University of Chicago. This research study is being completed for partial fulfillment of the requirements of obtaining a Doctorate of Education through Loyola University.

In order to conduct this research, I am in the process of recruiting a minimum of five current secondary school administrators or department chairs, specifically those holding instructional leadership positions, who have successfully led a school or district through a change in curriculum framework.

Participants must meet all of the following criteria:

- I am a secondary school administrator or department chair working in an instructional leadership position within a school or district that has changed its curriculum framework.
- The change in framework occurred within the last five years.
- The school or district continued to use the framework, or an enhanced version of the framework, for a minimum of one year after the framework was first implemented.

Experienced participants are being identified because of the unique perspective on this issue in relation to being a change agent within the area of implementing a new curriculum framework. You have been identified based on being an administrator, working in an instructional leadership position, within a secondary district or school that has started using Atlas within the last five years.

Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in the study.

Purpose: By participating in this study, you will help identify a set of consensus best practices that school leaders could consider when contemplating leading a school or district in changing framework for curriculum development.

Procedures: If you meet participation criteria and agree to be in the study, you will be asked to:

- Complete this consent to participate document and return to the researcher via email. Reading and completing this consent form should take no more than five minutes.
- Complete questionnaire one by answering the following question within the context of Kotter's Change Framework: What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as *best practices* when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development? Questionnaire one will take no longer than 30 minutes to complete.
- Review individual (and potentially coded) responses from questionnaire one. The process of reviewing individual responses should take no more than 15 minutes to complete.
- Complete questionnaire two by rating all potential responses on a Likert scale. Questionnaire two will take 15-20 minutes to complete.

Risks/Benefit: There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life.

Confidentiality:

- Participants will be identified by names through the process of completing this consent to participate form.
 - Consent forms will be secured in a locked cabinet in which the researcher is the only individual that has a key and subsequently can access. Consent forms will be kept indefinitely, per Loyola University's policy.
- Participants will not be identified by name, other than through communication with the researcher, during any other part of the research study.
- In order to detach contact information from participant data and make data de-identifiable, participants will be assigned a case number. The case number, absent from contact information, will be assigned to the data prior to analysis being completed.
 - When data is coded by both primary and secondary researchers, identifiable information will be removed and only case number will be attached.
 - When participant responses to questionnaire one are included within questionnaire two, they will not be attributed specifically to any individual participant.
- All spreadsheets with identifiable data will be kept in a locked file cabinet and will be shredded at the conclusion of the research project.

As this study is completely voluntary, you will be free to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty.

If you have any additional questions or concerns, please contact:

Jennifer Tyrrell
jtyrrell@luc.edu
(708) 870-7616

Brigid Schultz
BSchul1@luc.edu

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola University Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689.

Thank you for considering participating in my study. If you are willing to participate in this study, please complete the following statement of consent return to jtyrrell@luc.edu.

Statement of Consent:

Your signature below indicates that you have read the information provided above, have had an opportunity to ask questions, and agree to participate in this research study. You will be given a copy of this form for your records.

Participant's Signature

Date

Researcher's Signature

Date

I would greatly appreciate your contribution as an educational leader in this important study.

Thank you very much for your consideration,

Jennifer Tyrrell, Principal
Carl Sandburg High School
Doctoral Candidate, Loyola University

APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRE 1

----- Forwarded message -----

From: jtyrrell@luc.edu via
SurveyMonkey <member@surveymonkeyuser.com>
Date: Mon, Feb 18, 2019 at 2:23 PM
Subject: J. Tyrrell Research Study - Survey 1
To: <maugustyniak@d230.org>

What are the leadership actions
secondary school instructional
leaders should consider as best
practices when navigating the
process of changing the framework
for curriculum development?

Dear Educational Leader,

Thank you again for agreeing to participate in this research study. You are one of 20 Chicago Area panelists selected to participate so your input is extremely valuable. This study is simple and straightforward. Your participation should not require you to invest a significant amount of time.

As a quick review, the research is a three round Delphi study of schools/districts that experienced a successful change in curriculum framework. Specifically, through the research, I will determine if there is a set of consensus best practices that future school leaders could consider employing when contemplating leading a transition in curriculum framework. Your experience as a successful change agent leading this type of change gives you the unique perspective on this topic. The Delphi method supports the blending of the thoughts and opinions of experienced practitioners.

This survey is round one of the three round Delphi. It consists of one open-ended question. The remaining two rounds of the Delphi study will be formulated based on the compiled answers from the participants. Your responses will remain anonymous to the rest of the participants and will not be attributed directly to you.

Please review the directions and complete the survey through Survey Monkey within two weeks.

Directions: Please answer the open-ended questions as completely as you wish. Feel free to add additional thoughts as necessary. Individual quotes will not be attributed to anyone specifically, but may be used as part of reporting data. The question is:

What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

In order to help you organize your input, I have included Kotter's framework for effective organizational change. Kotter's 8 steps include:

Step 1: Establish a Sense of Urgency: Actions that craft and use a significant opportunity as a means for exciting people to sign up to change their organization.

Step 2: Creating a Guiding Coalition: Actions taken to assemble a group with the power and energy to lead and support a collaborative change effort.

Step 3: Develop a Change Vision: Actions to shape a vision to help steer the change effort and develop strategic initiatives to achieve that vision.

Step 4: Communicate the Vision for Buy-In: Actions designed to energize the people who are ready, willing, and urgent to drive change.

Step 5: Empower Broad Based Action: Actions that encourage change, remove obstacles to change, or change systems or structures that pose threats to the achievement of the vision.

Step 6: Generate Short-Term Wins: Actions designed to produce, track, evaluate and celebrate volumes of small and large accomplishments - and correlate them to results.

Step 7: Never Let Up: Actions focused on increasing credibility to change systems, promote and develop employees who can implement the vision; reinvigorate the process with new projects, themes and volunteers.

Step 8: Incorporate Change into the Culture: Actions that make connections between the new behaviors and organizational success, and develop the means to ensure leadership development and succession.

As you answer this question, please feel free to be as expansive as you can to generate the broadest and most inclusive list possible. Please feel free to offer as many leadership actions as you feel are important into any of these categories. It is also acceptable to leave an entire category blank. I have included a space labeled "other" for you should you think of action(s) that don't fall into any of Kotter's steps.

Please complete the survey through Survey Monkey.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Tyrrell

Doctoral Candidate, Loyola University

jtyrrell@luc.edu

What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

Question Title

1. What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to **Establishing a Sense of Urgency**?

Question Title

2. What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to **Creating a Guiding Coalition**?

Question Title

3. What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to **Developing a Change Vision**?

Question Title

4. What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to **Communicating the Vision for Buy-In**?

Question Title

5. What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to **Empowering Broad Based Action**?

Question Title

6. What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to **Generating Short-Term Wins**?

Question Title

7. What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to **Never Letting Up**?

Question Title

8. What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to **Incorporating Change into the Culture**?

Question Title

9. Please list **OTHER** best leadership practices and actions that do not fall into any of Kotter's steps.

APPENDIX C
QUESTIONNAIRE 2

jtyrrell@luc.edu via
SurveyMonkey <member@surveymonkeyuser.com> [Unsubscribe](#)

Tue, Mar 26,
6:48 AM

to me

Questionnaire 2 - What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

Dear Educational Leader,

Thank you for your participation within the first two rounds of the research study entitled Best Practices for Leading a Transition in Curriculum Framework in Secondary Schools. Within this questionnaire, you will be asked to rate leadership actions an instructional leader should consider when leading his/her secondary school through the process of changing framework for curriculum development to address the stages included within Kotter's framework. The scale is as follows:

- A rating of 1 represents an action that is deemed not critical to the success of the change effort.
- A rating of 2 represents an action that is deemed somewhat critical to the success of the change effort.
- A rating of 3 represents an action that is deemed critical to the success of the change effort.
- A rating of 4 represents an action that is deemed very critical to the success of the change effort

Do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Please complete questionnaire two through the Survey Monkey link within two weeks.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Tyrrell
Doctoral Candidate, Loyola University
jtyrrell@luc.edu

Questionnaire 2 - What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

Step 1 - Establish a Sense of Urgency

Please rate the following leadership actions an instructional leader should consider when leading his/her secondary school through the process of changing framework for curriculum development to address the element "Establish a Sense of Urgency":

1. Communicate "the why" and reason for change

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

2. Outline steps to the change process

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

3. Review student performance data

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

4. Review school performance data

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

5. Collaboratively involve staff in the process

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

6. Collaboratively involve all stakeholders in the process

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

7. Communicate need for improved student achievement

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

8. Communicate state mandates relevant to the proposed change

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. Share societal expectations about the changes needed for educational systems

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. Share that students in common courses skills are varied

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. Identify standards and evaluation measures

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. Cultivate buy-in before taking action

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. Utilize research based practices

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Questionnaire 2 - What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

Step 2 - Creating a Guiding Coalition

Please rate the following leadership actions an instructional leader should consider when leading his/her secondary school through the process of changing framework for curriculum development to address the element "Creating a Guiding Coalition":

14. Employ a research-based decision making strategy

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15. Identify the readiness for change within the organization

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

16. Identify the exact parameters for change

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

17. Develop a team with diverse perspectives to support the change

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18. Ensure team members stay committed to "the why"

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

19. Allow for study, research, and implementation of practices

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

20. Observe other programs, pilot, and analyze results

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

21. Have individual conversation to understand personal vision and beliefs of staff

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

22. Work with the team and re-evaluate as needed

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

23. Support team in implementation of change initiative

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

24. Ensure team communication to other stakeholders

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

Questionnaire 2 - What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

Step 3 - Develop a Change Vision

Please rate the following leadership actions an instructional leader should consider when leading his/her secondary school through the process of changing framework for curriculum development to address the element "Develop a Change Vision":

25. Ensure the change is reflective of organizational values

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

26. Outline specific action steps and desired outcomes

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

27. Develop a team committed to the change process

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

28. Select a leader capable of leading the change process

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

29. Remind everyone why the work needs to occur

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

30. Envision the future with the change in place

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

31. Ensure common language among members of change process

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

32. Provide opportunities for staff to inform the vision for change

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

33. State the vision in terms of benefits for students

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

34. Show alignment of curriculum development to strategic plan

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

35. Ensure appropriate communication

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

36. Remain focused on growth and improvement of outcomes

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

37. Allow team time to process ideas without judgement

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

Questionnaire 2 - What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

Step 4 - Communicate Vision for Buy-In

Please rate the following leadership actions an instructional leader should consider when leading his/her secondary school through the process of changing framework for curriculum development to address the element "Communicate the Vision for Buy-In":

38. Identify benefits and potential struggles

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

39. State vision in terms of benefit to students

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

40. Utilize a variety of communication methods with all stakeholders

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

41. Ensure transparency in communication

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

42. Ensure continual communication

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

43. Determine benchmarks and celebrate progress along the way

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

44. Allow opportunities for feedback and reflection from stakeholders to connect with the vision

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

45. Work with key stakeholders to study best-practices for implementation

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

46. Start with a large group roll-out followed by small group processing

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

47. Model your expectations

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

48. Provide opportunities for staff to participate in PD to gain perspective to the change process

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

Questionnaire 2 - What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

Step 5 - Empower Broad-Based Action

Please rate the following leadership actions an instructional leader should consider when leading his/her secondary school through the process of changing framework for curriculum development to address the element "Empower Broad Based Action":

49. Ensure the change process is at the forefront

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

50. Allow opportunities for individuals to be involved in the change process

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

51. Identify obstacles that may impact change

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

52. Identify solutions to potential obstacles

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

53. Identify key leaders with authority to make the change sustainable

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

54. Provide support and structure for those leading the change

1 - Not Critical 2 - Somewhat Critical 3 - Critical 4 - Very Critical

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

55. Provide opportunities for new leaders to emerge

1 - Not Critical 2 - Somewhat Critical 3 - Critical 4 - Very Critical

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

56. Provide critical feedback to those leading the change

1 - Not Critical 2 - Somewhat Critical 3 - Critical 4 - Very Critical

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

57. Meet with resisters to address fears and concerns

1 - Not Critical 2 - Somewhat Critical 3 - Critical 4 - Very Critical

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

58. Continually communicate and document change process

1 - Not Critical 2 - Somewhat Critical 3 - Critical 4 - Very Critical

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

59. Reward change agents

1 - Not Critical 2 - Somewhat Critical 3 - Critical 4 - Very Critical

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Questionnaire 2 - What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

Step 6 - Generate Short-Term Wins

Please rate the following leadership actions an instructional leader should consider when leading his/her secondary school through the process of changing framework for curriculum development to address the element "Generate Short-Term Wins":

60. Establish short-term goals and monitor progress

1 - Not Critical 2 - Somewhat Critical 3 - Critical 4 - Very Critical

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

61. Communicate with all stakeholders

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

62. Start with the easy work

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

63. Consider both macro non-negotiables and micro team-level goals

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

64. Determine success metrics for the change process

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

65. Celebrate the accomplishments of the organization

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

66. Share positive feedback from stakeholders

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

67. Dedicate time for teachers to share their stories and showcase successes

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

68. Allow for cross-district communication around successes and failures

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

69. Show direct links between the work and its results and how the results link to student achievement

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

70. Show gratitude to team members

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

71. Make adjustments as necessary

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

72. Make positive outcomes evident by piloting components of the change

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Questionnaire 2 - What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

Step 7 - Never Let Up

Please rate the following leadership actions an instructional leader should consider when leading his/her secondary school through the process of changing framework for curriculum development to address the element "Never Let Up":

73. Provide support and encouragement along the implementation journey

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

74. Stay focused on the desired outcome

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

75. Conduct analysis and empower staff to determine improvement

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

76. Ensure leaders continually model change

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

77. Ensure all stakeholders can articulate the change

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

78. Build a community of trust

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

79. Support innovative shifts and modifications to move the change along

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

80. Celebrate wins to build excitement

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

81. Help others feel an urgency to contribute

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

82. Recognize and acknowledge when things aren't working and adjust

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

83. Articulate individual roles and responsibilities of team members

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

84. Develop stages of the change so that various individuals can be involved

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

85. Maintain consistent messaging across all stakeholder groups

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

86. Look out for signs of implementation fatigue

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

87. Include professional learning as a means to encourage self-efficacy

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

88. Promote reflection on the progress that has been made

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Questionnaire 2 - What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

Step 8 - Incorporate Change into the Culture

Please rate the following leadership actions an instructional leader should consider when leading his/her secondary school through the process of changing framework for curriculum development to address the element "Incorporate Change into the Culture":

89. Develop trust among all stakeholders

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

90. Focus on "the why" behind the change

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

91. Make the change a priority and keep it in mind when making other decisions

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

92. Implement change that impacts all students

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

93. Set an expectation for change within the culture by creating a cohesive team

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

94. Have a plan for assessing impact from the beginning

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

95. Involve multiple leaders so that the change leadership is not put on one person

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

96. Focus on access and advocacy

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

97. Ensure building administration feels supported by district office and the BOE

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

98. Allow for bottom-up change with key stakeholders

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

99. Regularly communicate the vision to all members of the organization

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

100. Provide professional development, including time to discuss the change and reflect on it

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

101. Acknowledge efforts of guiding coalition and key staff

1 - Not Critical	2 - Somewhat Critical	3 - Critical	4 - Very Critical
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

102. Celebrate the accomplishments and recognize the set backs

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

103. Make positive outcomes evident by piloting components of the change

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

104. Maintain creative tension in the system

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

105. Employ a mindset of continuous improvement

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

106. Find a mantra that summarizes the change and make it a part of your brand

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

107. Dedicate time for teachers to share their stories and showcase successes

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

108. Have students share the positive impact of the change on their learning

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐
☐
☐
☐

Questionnaire 2 - What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

Other

Please rate the following leadership actions an instructional leader should consider when leading his/her secondary school through the process of changing framework for curriculum development. These coded responses were shared by participants within the space labeled other. These are actions that participants believed don't fall into any of Kotter's steps, although relevant to this

questionnaire, some are also included as potential actions within Kotter's steps.

109. Provide sincere gratitude towards those that have engaged in the change

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐☐☐☐

110. Share successes, both inside and outside the organization

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐☐☐☐

111. Admit and confront mistakes head on

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐☐☐☐

112. Build a network of colleagues outside of your organization that have experienced a similar change

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐☐☐☐

113. Review student performance data

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐☐☐☐

114. Review school performance data

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐☐☐☐

115. Continually review data to keep "the why" in the forefront

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐☐☐☐

116. Build trust, show empathy, and create a family-like environment

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐☐☐☐

117. Ensure leaders continually model change

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐☐☐☐

118. Respond to staff needs during the process

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐☐☐☐

119. Establish and maintain a positive and supportive atmosphere

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐☐☐☐

120. Determine benchmarks and celebrate progress along the way

1 - Not Critical

2 - Somewhat Critical

3 - Critical

4 - Very Critical

☐☐☐☐

APPENDIX D
VERIFICATION OF RESPONSES

Tyrrell, Jennifer

Reply all

Mon 3/18, 12:17 AM

cwilliams@bhsd228.com;

jtyrrell@d230.org

Review of Coded Responses - Corrine Williams .pdfWilliams Responses.pdf

84 KB

46 KB

2 attachments (130 KB) Download all

Save all to OneDrive - Loyola University Chicago

Dear Corrine,

Thanks for your participation in Round 1 (Questionnaire #1) of my study. In order for me to ensure credibility of my study, I am asking each respondent to quickly review my analysis of the feedback and input I received from you to ensure that I have accurately and adequately coded your responses for the next round. Many of the responses I received from the panel are very similar to or identical to others' responses. In order to create a clear and concise list of actions for the panel to individually rate for importance in the next round of inquiry, I was required to make an attempt to paraphrase/edit/combine feedback for future analysis. My hopes are that I have done so without fundamentally changing the essence of your input.

I have attached two documents; one includes your responses and the other is my analysis and interpretation of your responses. My analysis has attempted to create a synthesis of many responses into a set of leadership actions which the panel will rate for their importance to leading this type of change. If you agree that my analysis is accurate and reflective of the intent of your feedback, simply reply "Looks good" to this email. Of course, if you feel that I have missed the mark, let me know where and how I could improve my analysis. Please complete this process within two weeks. After this step, I will be asking you to complete one final survey which will take no longer than 20 minutes to complete.

Thank you for taking a few minutes to verify my work! Again, I really appreciate your participation in my study!

Jennifer Tyrrell
Principal Carl Sandburg High School
Doctoral Candidate, Loyola University

APPENDIX E

SAMPLE OF PARTICIPANT RESPONSES

What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

SurveyMonkey

#17

COMPLETE

Collector: Email Invitation 1 (Email)
Started: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 7:56:20 AM
Last Modified: Wednesday, March 06, 2019 8:53:05 AM
Time Spent: 00:56:44
Email: cwilliams@bhsd228.com
IP Address: 96.5.98.219

Page 1

Q1 What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to Establishing a Sense of Urgency?

For change to take place, there has to be a substantial reason to make the change. Changing for change sake will not produce lasting results. At times we can use the State, such as mandates handed down, as the impetus whereby producing a sense of urgency. For the two major curricular changes in our district that I am thinking about, the sense of urgency for both was to improve student achievement. The first large change was our conversion to Physics First. The need for change was based on three things: 1) we have 23 feeder schools, and they were all teaching science differently especially in grades 6 - 8; as a result, the students entering high school had vastly different skill sets; 2) our failure rate in freshmen biology was too high; the content can be a bit abstract for freshmen; and 3) teachers were getting frustrated with each other because they felt students were not being prepared for the next course; at one point we had six different science courses offered at the 9th grade. For the second major change, moving to an integrated math program, the sense of urgency was two-fold: 1) failure rates in math were the highest in the district; and 2) standardized test scores were flat lining or getting worse. We needed to teach math differently.

Q2 What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to Creating a Guiding Coalition?

In order for change to take shape, I believe it starts with buy-in. This is done through researching and observing best practices. In the physics first example, we piloted the inverted sequence at one of the high schools for a handful of years and analyzed student achievement results comparing students in the traditional track with those in the physics first track. For the integrated math change, teams of teachers were sent out to observe districts that converted to integrated math. Other groups researched teaching through a Common Core method. Both groups made presentations to the full department and voted on the best course of action. In both the physics first and integrated math examples, there was a core group of teachers committed to the change. It is important to have a group take up the charge for making the change happen. It won't work if the leader is the only one in support of the change.

Q3 What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to Developing a Change Vision?

Once the team is committed to making the change happen, it is important to outline action steps: the target date for implementation, curriculum to write, identifying professional development needed for the staff, who is going to start teaching the new courses, etc.

Q4 What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to Communicating the Vision for Buy-In?

While the guiding coalition is working on the nuts and bolts of the change, the leader should communicate to stakeholders throughout the whole change process why the change is necessary. What are the benefits? Where are teachers/students going to struggle? Communications also need to go out to parents outlining the reasons and benefits of the change. With respect to both physics first and integrated math, leaders also needed to communicate frequently with the feeder schools. Our changes drastically impact how the feeder schools prepare their students for high school.

What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

SurveyMonkey

Q5 What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to Empowering Broad Based Action?

In both of my examples, the biggest threat to change comes from those individuals that have not bought in from the beginning. Mostly this is out of fear - fear of change; fear of failure; fear of the unknown. Leaders need to continue talking to these individuals; however, they should not be allowed to derail the change. In both of my examples, there was a large enough team of teachers to get the ball rolling. They were excited for the change and believed in what they were doing. Their passion and commitment to the change made it happen.

Q6 What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to Generating Short-Term Wins?

Change takes a long time in education, so embedding short-term wins is key to keeping the momentum going. In both of my examples, the "wins" were more about the collaboration among teachers that never existed before. For the first time, everyone was teaching the same content. Teachers were reaching out across the district celebrating successes and asking for help when activities failed. Failures rates in both science and math decreased. Leaders were quick to make adjustments, when needed, to keep teachers moving forward with the new curriculum.

Q7 What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to Never Letting Up?

All too often initiatives are abandoned because change is hard. Leaders need to help the team stay the course. Often times, leaders need to be the cheerleaders when the teachers start to struggle. In both of my examples, teachers never experienced physics first or integrated math themselves, so they do not have any reference points. Leaders need to be quick to reinforce the vision that was set forth at the beginning of the process and remind teachers they are doing the right thing for students.

Q8 What are the best leadership practices and actions specifically aligned to Incorporating Change into the Culture?

Both of my examples include curricular changes at grades 9, 10 and 11. As each grade level comes on board, a new group of teachers are brought into the change process. Leaders need to revisit the vision for the change and ensure that curriculum is vertically aligned. Eventually, the majority of the teachers in the department will be a part of change. In order for teachers to be successful, it is often necessary to provide additional professional development in order for the change to become the new culture. This includes time for the teachers to discuss how the new curriculum is working to improve student learning.

Q9 Please list OTHER best leadership practices and actions that do not fall into any of Kotter's steps.

Respondent skipped this question

APPENDIX F

SAMPLE OF PARTICIPANT CODED RESPONSES

Review of Coded Responses: Corrine Williams

What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

Kotter's framework for effective organizational change - 8 steps	Coded Responses
Step 1: Establish a Sense of Urgency: Actions that craft and use a significant opportunity as a means for exciting people to sign up to change their organization.	Communicate "the why" and reason for change" Review student performance data Review school performance data Communicate need for improved student achievement Collaboratively involve staff in the process Communicate state mandates relevant to the proposed change
Step 2: Creating a Guiding Coalition: Actions taken to assemble a group with the power and energy to lead and support a collaborative change effort.	Develop a team with diverse perspectives to support the change Allow for study, research, and implementation of practices Observe other programs, pilot, and analyze results
Step 3: Develop a Change Vision: Actions to shape a vision to help steer the change effort and develop strategic initiatives to achieve that vision.	Outline specific action steps and desired outcomes Develop a team committed to the change process
Step 4: Communicate the Vision for Buy-In: Actions designed to energize the people who are ready, willing, and urgent to drive change.	Utilize a variety of communication methods with all stakeholders Identify benefits and potential struggles
Step 5: Empower Broad Based Action: Actions that encourage change, remove obstacles to change, or change systems or structures that pose threats to the achievement of the vision.	Identify obstacles that may impact change Continually communicate and document change process
Step 6: Generate Short-Term Wins: Actions designed to produce, track, evaluate and celebrate volumes of small and large accomplishments - and correlate them to results.	Allow for cross-district communication around success and failures Make adjustments as necessary
Step 7: Never Let Up: Actions focused on increasing credibility to	Provide support and encouragement along the implementation journey

change systems, promote and develop employees who can implement the vision; reinvigorate the process with new projects, themes and volunteers.	Stay focused on the desired outcome
Step 8: Incorporate Change into the Culture: Actions that make connections between the new behaviors and organizational success, and develop the means to ensure leadership development and succession.	Regularly communicate the vision to all members of the organization Provide professional development, including time to discuss the change and reflect on it
I have included a space labeled " other " for you should you think of action(s) that don't fall into any of Kotter's steps.	

APPENDIX G
ADDITIONAL EMAILS TO PARTICIPANTS

Reminder to complete Questionnaire 1

----- Forwarded message -----

From: jtyrrell@luc.edu via

SurveyMonkey <member@surveymonkeyuser.com>

Date: Tue, Feb 26, 2019 at 12:59 PM

Subject: Reminder: Please complete this survey by Monday, March 4, 2019 -

Thank you!

To: <maugustyniak@d230.org>

What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

We recently contacted you about a survey, but haven't received your responses. We'd really appreciate your participation.

Click the button below to start or continue the survey. Thank you for your time.

Reminder to complete Questionnaire 2

Questionnaire 2 - What are the leadership actions secondary school instructional leaders should consider as best practices when navigating the process of changing the framework for curriculum development?

We recently contacted you about a survey, but haven't received your responses. We'd really appreciate your participation.

Click the button below to start or continue the survey. Thank you for your time.

Reminder to complete Verification of Responses

Mar 24, 2019, 10:53 AM

Dear Dan,

Thanks for your participation in Round 1 (Questionnaire #1) of my study. In order for me to ensure credibility of my study, I am asking each respondent to quickly review my analysis of the feedback and input I received from you to ensure that I have accurately and adequately coded your responses for the next round. Many of the responses I received from the panel are very similar to or identical to others' responses. In order to create a clear and concise list of actions for the panel to individually rate for importance in the next round of inquiry, I was required to make an attempt to paraphrase/edit/combine feedback for future analysis. My hopes are that I have done so without fundamentally changing the essence of your input.

I have attached two documents; one includes your responses and the other is my analysis and interpretation of your responses. My analysis has attempted to create a synthesis of many responses into a set of leadership actions which the panel will rate for their importance to leading this type of change. If you agree that my analysis is accurate and reflective of the intent of your feedback, simply reply "Looks good" to this email. Of course, if you feel that I have missed the mark, let me know where and how I could improve my analysis. This is a reminder that you have one week remaining to complete the verification process. After this step, I will be asking you to complete one final survey which will take no longer than 20 minutes to complete.

APPENDIX H
PERMISSION TO REPLICATE

Dissertation Research

Inbox

Jennifer Tyrrell <jtyrrell@d230.org>

Wed, Apr 5, 2017,
7:21 PM

to acarter, bcc: Jennifer

Good Evening Dr. Carter,

My name is Jennifer Tyrrell and I am an Associate Principal at Amos Alonzo Stagg High School in the south suburbs of Chicago. I am currently pursuing my doctorate in Administration and Supervision at Loyola University in Chicago. I am working on my dissertation and am studying leadership of curricular change. I am planning to use Kotter as my theoretical framework.

I am currently working on my review of relevant literature and came across your dissertation. Your dissertation has given me much hope and excitement! I am writing to formally request replicating your research in order to study curricular change. I would like to use your initial instrument and also utilize the second tool you used after the initial leadership practices are identified.

I hope you will consider.

With hope and excitement!

Alex Carter <ACarter@coloradoedinitiative.org>

Thu, Apr 6, 2017,
10:00 AM

to me

Hi Jennifer;

I would be pleased for you use my research as a road map for your dissertation! I have to say, after two false starts on my own study, switching to the Delphi Method was a critical to my success. The instruments I used were simple and straightforward, the analysis was uncomplicated and arriving at consensus (or not) was relatively easily accomplished, and the mechanisms for gathering raw data (asynchronous, individual surveys) were not terribly time consuming for the participants (therefore resulted in a good return rate) or the researcher (resulting in a fast study!). I'm surprised this method isn't more widely employed.

If there is anything I can do, don't hesitate.

Best of luck!

Alex

Alex Carter, Ed.D

Vice President, External Relations

The Colorado Education Initiative

1660 Lincoln Street | Suite 2000 | Denver, CO 80264
720-502-4705 (office) | 970-708-7405 (cell)

acarter@coloradoedinitiative.org |

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/alex-carter-ed-d-9bb5437>

Twitter [alexCEIcarter](#)

APPENDIX I

DELPHI METHOD – RESEARCHER’S REFLECTION

At the beginning of my research journey, it was clear to me that I wanted to study the process of leading change within the area of curriculum. What was not clear (at all) was how I would pursue my research; I had no idea the methodology that I would employ. And then, I came across Dr. Carter's research, and it all came together! In fact, the biggest turning point for me, my biggest breakthrough, came when I was introduced to the Delphi Method after reading Dr. Carter's dissertation! Very shortly after, I shared the study with Dr. Schultz and then subsequently sent Dr. Carter an email, inquiring if I could replicate his research. Dr. Carter not only responded to my email and shared his support for me replicating his research, but he expressed genuine excitement that I would be using his research as a "roadmap" for my dissertation.

Dr. Carter shared with me that he had a couple of "false starts" within his research before switching to the Delphi Method. He shared that the instruments were straightforward, consensus building was not complicated, and that completion of the questionnaires was not time consuming for participants. It struck me that Dr. Carter shared that he was surprised that the Delphi Method is not used more frequently. After completing my research, Dr. Carter's reflections completely resonate with me.

As I shared within chapter III, my topic, theoretical framework, and research design came together once I discovered Carter's (2016) research and gained permission to replicate his study within the context of curriculum framework. I knew from the beginning I wanted to research leading curricular change; things became more clear when I came across Kotter's (1996, 2012) Framework; the idea became a reality when I read Carter's study and selected the Delphi Method as the methodology for this research. This

was a turning point in my dissertation journey and I remember having one of my first, ‘I think I will finish’ thoughts, one of my first breakthrough moments.

I love a lot of things about the Delphi Method. I truly feel like anyone conducting research can employ Delphi with fidelity. Delphi Methodology is an iterative process, but equally as important, it provides a roadmap for building consensus. Within educational leadership, building consensus can be challenging. The framework of using a series of questionnaires makes the process more realistic and attainable. Distributing voice is also a challenge within educational leadership; using Delphi ensures that all participants will be able to share their perspective and not be influenced by others.

I feel strongly that utilizing Delphi method within my research influenced the number of participants. Delphi method was employed through administering multiple questionnaires. I am convinced that the fact that participants could complete the questionnaires asynchronously, combined with the limited time commitment, resulted in 11 individuals completing all aspects/components.

I would encourage not just future researchers to utilize the Delphi Method, but would encourage educational leaders to use the method in practice. A reflection that I had regularly throughout my research journey was that Delphi Method can be used to garner stakeholder input in a different way that captures stakeholders’ voice. Often, in education, we create surveys and send them out as a means of garnering feedback. Engaging with Delphi through this research has me thinking about how we can approach garnering feedback differently by asking stakeholders to answer open ended questions prior to creating surveys or feedback forms. Initial responses can be coded and surveys/feedback forms can be created; stakeholders would likely see their suggestions

included within the surveys/feedback forms and strengthen their perception of having voice in a process.

As I shared, finding Carter's research and identifying the Delphi Method as the methodology I would use for my research was a significant breakthrough moment for me within my dissertation journey. In fact, as I closed my defense, I shared that, "sometimes you have to push through to breakthrough." It is my hope that other researchers consider this method, especially if they are in need of a breakthrough!

REFERENCE LIST

- Amabile, T., & Kramer, S. (2011). *The progress principles: using small wins to ignite joy, engagement, and creativity at work*. Boston, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 421-49.
- Badshah. (2012). Historical studies of leadership theories. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, 1(1), 49-59.
- Baron, D. (1999). *Moses on management: 50 leadership lessons from the greatest manager of all time*. New York, NY: Pocket Books.
- Barth, R. (1986). *Improving schools from within*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Basiratmand, M. (2013). *Transformation of Palm Beach Community College to Palm Beach State College: A case study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI Number: 3585021)
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership*, 3rd edition. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*, 4th edition. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1999, May/June). Steps to keeping change efforts heading in the right direction. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 7-11.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1992). Leading and managing: Effects of context, culture, and gender. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, 314-329.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1984). *Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), 34-64.
- Brady, S. (2015). Utilizing and adapting the Delphi method for use in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 14(5), 1-6.
- Burke, C. S., Stagal, K. C., Klein, C., Goodwin, G. F., Salas, E., & Halpin, S. M. (2006). What type of leadership behaviors are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(3), 288-307.
- Burke, W. W., Lake, D. G., & Paine, J. W. (Eds). (2009). *Organization change: A comprehensive reader*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Burns, B. (2004). Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: A re-appraisal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(6), 977-1002.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., & LeMahieu (2016). *Learning to improve: How America's schools can get better at getting better*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Carter, A. B. (2016). *Best practices for leading a transition to standards-based grading in secondary schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 10024533)
- Collins, J. C. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap--and others don't*. New York, NY: HarperBusiness.
- Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement: What the research says*. ASCD.
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). 2015
- Cuban, L. (1984). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms, 1890-1980*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Daly, A. J. (2009). Rigid response in an age of accountability the potential of leadership and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 168-216.
- Daniels, D. M. (2009). *Leadership, learning and school change: The elementary principal's role in teacher professional development* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3366276).
- Davidson, P. (2013). The Delphi technique in doctoral research: Considerations and rationale. *Review of Higher Education and Self-Learning*, 6(22), 53-65.

- Day, D. V., Gronn, P., & Salas, E. (2004). Leadership capacity in teams. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 857-880.
- Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of crisis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Center for Advanced Engineering.
- DeWitt, P. (2016, January 12). Do school leaders really start with ‘why’. Retrieved from https://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/finding_common_ground/2016/01/do_school_leaders_really_start_with_why.html
- DuFour, R. (2015). *In praise of American education*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- DuFour, R., & DuFour, R. (2012). *The school leader's guide to professional learning communities at work*, 2nd edition. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- DuFour, R., & Fullan, M. (2013). *Cultures built to last: Systemic PLCs at work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Edmonds, R. R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-24.
- Eilers, L. H., & D'Amico, M. (2012). Essential leadership elements in implementing common core state standards. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 78(4), 46-50.
- From-Friesen, B. S. (2012). *Elementary school principal teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of Kotter's strategies used to change teacher instructional deliver to improve student success in algebra I* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2011). *Change leader: Learning to do what matters most*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2011). *The six secrets of change*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass.
- Garvin, D. (2000). *Learning in action: A guide to putting the learning organization to work*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Gaubatz, J. A. (2012). *Secondary school science department chairs leading change* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3527915)

- Geist, M. R. (2010). Using the Delphi method to engage stakeholders: A comparison of two studies. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 33(2), 147-154.
- Giannarou, L., & Zervas, E. (2014). Using Delphi technique to build consensus in practice. *International Journal of Business Science and Applied Management*, 9(2), 65-82.
- Giltinane, C. L. (2013). Leadership styles and theories. *Nursing Standard*, 27(41), 35-39.
- Goleman, D. (2000, March-April). *The soul at work*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Golm, H. (2009). *Examining the relationship between transformational, transactional, and change-oriented leadership and their influence on leadership effectiveness* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3373742)
- Goodson, I. (2001). Social histories of educational change. *Journal of Educational Change*, 2(1), 45-63.
- Gray, S. P. (2005). *Good to great: A qualitative study of school principals who made the leap* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3175052)
- Green, P. J. (1982, March). *The content of a college-level outdoor leadership course*. Paper presented at the Conference of the Northwest District Association for the American alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, Spokane, WA.
- Greenleaf, R. (1977). *Servant Leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Greenleaf, R. (1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis, IN: Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership.
- Greenleaf, R. K., & Spears, L. C. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*, 25th anniversary edition. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Grimm, J. W. (2010). Effective leadership: Making the difference. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*, 36(1), 74-77.
- Habibi, A., Sarafrazi, A., & Izadyar, S. (2011). Delphi technique theoretical framework in qualitative research. *The International Journal of Engineering and Science*, 3(4), 8-13.

- Hallinger, P. (1982). *Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale*. Sarasota, FL: Leading Development Associates.
- Hallinger, P. (2011). A review of three decades of doctoral studies using the principal instructional management rating scale: A lens on methodological progress in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(2), 271-206.
- Hambleton, R., & Gumpert, R. (1982). The validity of Hersey and Blanchard's theory of leader effectiveness. *Group and Organization Studies*, 7, 225-242.
- Havard, T. S., Morgan, J., & Patrick, L. (2010). Providing authentic leadership opportunities through collaboratively developed internships: A university-school district partnership initiative. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 5, 460-480. Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ913599)
- Harvey, T., & Broyles, E. (2010). *Resistance to change: A guide to harnessing its positive power*. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1996). Great ideas revisited: Life-cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development*, 50(1), 42. Retrieved from <http://flagship.luc.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/227028768?accountid=12163>
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). *Management of organizational behavior*, 4th edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hollander, E. (1974). Process of leadership emergence. *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 19-31.
- Horwitz, I. B., Horwitz, S. K., Daram, P., Brandt, M. L., Brunicardi, F. C., & Awad, S. S. (2008). Transformational, transactional, and passive-avoidant leadership characteristics of a surgical resident cohort: analysis using the multifactor leadership questionnaire and implications for improving surgical education curriculums. *Journal of Surgical Research*, 148(1), 49-59.
- House, R. (1977). *A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership*. Working Paper Series 76-06. Toronto University (Ontario).
- Howard, W. C. (2005). Leadership: Four styles. *Education*, 126(2), 384.
- Hsu, C., & Sandford, B. (2007). The Delphi technique: Making sense of consensus. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 12(10), 1-8.
- Institute for Educational Leadership. (2000). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship*. Washington DC.

- Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). 1996.
- Johnson, E. (1999). Reform in teacher education: The response to accountability is collaboration. *Education*, 119(3), 381-387.
- Johnstone, C. J., Dikkers, A. G., & Luedeke, A. (2009). Educational Leadership in the Era of Accountability. *Educational Considerations*, 36(2), 14-18.
- Jorgensen, M. (2014). *Barriers to curricular change in general education mathematics at a large public institution* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3683584)
- Joyce, S. (2009). *A comparison of leadership attributes between public and charter school principals and their student achievement* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI Number: 3364046)
- Kirkpatrick, D. (1996). Great ideas revisited (evaluation of employee training programs) (Celebrating 50 Years). *Training and Development*, 50(1), 54.
- Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Kotter, J. P., & Cohen, D. S. (2002). *The heart of change: Real-life stories of how people change their organizations*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- LaChance, L. L. (2007). *Moving schools from good to great: A study of excellence in education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3254725)
- Landis, E. A., Hill, D., & Harvey, M. (2014). A synthesis of leadership theories and styles. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 15(2), 97-100.
- Leithwood, K. A., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University, Laboratory for Student Success.
- Linn, R. L., Baker, E. L., & Betebenner, D. W. (2002). Accountability systems: Implications of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. *Educational Researcher*, 31(6), 3-16.
- Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (Eds.). (2002). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications* [Electronic version]. Newark, NJ: New Jersey Institute of Technology.

- Litchka, P. R. (2007). No leader left behind: Planning to prepare effective educational leaders in this era of accountability. *Educational Planning*, 16(2), 44-52.
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic leadership: A positive developmental approach. In *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline*, ed. K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (pp. 241-258). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Maccoby, M. (1979). Leadership needs of the 1980's. *Current Issues in Higher Education*, 2, 17-23.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mento, A. J., Jones, R. M., & Dirndorfer, W. (2002). A change management process: Grounded in both theory and practice. *Journal of Change Management*, 3(1), 45.
- Mintzberg, H., & Westley, F. (1992). Cycles of organizational change. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13, 39.
- National Commission of Excellence in Education. (1983). *A Nation at Risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Nelson, D., & Quick, J. (1994). *Organizational behavior: Foundations, realities, and challenges*. New York, NY: West.
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001*. Public Law 107-110.
- Pearce, C. L., & Conger, J. A. 2003. *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perry, B. A. (2013). *Effective educational leadership attributes of Indiana high school principals* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3589545)
- Prater, M. L. (2013). *Perceptions of the full range leadership model practiced by select high school administrators in Tennessee* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieve from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3612227).

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL). 2015.

Reeves, D. B. (2009). *Leading change in your school: How to conquer myths, build commitment, and get results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Ritter, S. J. (2013). *An examination of how principals lead instructional change in rural high schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI Number: 3576034)

Rolfe, P. (2011). Transformational leadership theory: what every leader needs to know. *Nurse Leader*, 9(2), 54-57.

Rouse, T. R. (2011). *The role of the district superintendent as an instructional leader in systemic change* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI Number: 3510722)

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles [i.e., Thousand Oaks, CA]: SAGE Publications.

Schein, E. H. (1996). Kurt Lewin's change theory in the field and in the classroom: Notes toward a model of managed learning. *Systems Practice*, 9(1), 27-47.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T. (2005). *Strengthening the heartbeat: Leading and learning together in schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sims H. P., Faraj, S., & Yun, S. (2009). When should a leader be directive or empowering? How to develop your own situational leadership theory of leadership. *Business Horizons*, 52(2), 149-158.

Sinek, S. (2009). *Start with why: How great leaders inspire everyone to take action*. New York, NY: Portfolio.

Sosik, J. J., & Dionne, S. D. (1997). Leadership styles and Deming's behavior factors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 11(4), 447-462.

Spears, L. (1995). Servant leadership and the Greenleaf legacy. In L.C. Spears (Ed.), *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant leadership influences today's top management thinkers* (pp. 1-7). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Squires, M. E. (2011). *Educational leadership at Lyon big picture school, a non-traditional high school, a case study* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3461476).
- Sutton, J., & Austin, Z. (2015). Qualitative research: Data collection, analysis, and management. *The Canadian Journal of Hospital Pharmacy*, 68(3), 226-231.
- Tilford, K. L. (2007). *The essence of the principal's role in a professional development school* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3532533)
- Turner, E. T. (2014). *Using an accelerated change strategy to shift teachers' perceptions to globally defined excellence: An action research study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI Number: 3646862)
- Vinkenburg, C. J., Van Engen, M. L., Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Shmidt, M. C. (2011). An exploration of stereotypical beliefs about leadership styles: is transformational leadership a route to women's promotion? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1), 10-21.
- Von der Gracht, H. (2012). Consensus measurement in Delphi studies: Review and implications for future quality assurance. *Technology Forecasting and Social Change*, 79, 1525-1536.
- Waldman, M. (1993). A theoretical consideration of leadership and TQM. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4(1), 65-79.
- Warner, L. (2014). Using the Delphi technique to achieve consensus: A tool for guiding extension programs, AEC521, one of a series of the Department of Agricultural Education and Communication, UF/IFAS Extension. Visit the EDIS website at <http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu>
- Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Website: <http://www.jimcollins.com/about.html>
- Website: <http://www.leebolman.com/>
- Website: www.michaelfullan.com

Website: <https://www.rubicon.com/offerings/atlas-curriculum-design/>

Website: <http://www.schoolimprovement.com/experts/terrence-deal/>

Wong-Kim, J. C. W. N. (2012). *Creating a climate for innovation in education: Reframing structure, culture, and leadership practices* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3514349)

Zanglin, L. (2001). *Comparing good to great hiring practices in private and public schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3469792)

VITA

Jennifer Tyrrell is the daughter of John and Valarie Tyrrell and was born in Chicago Heights, Illinois on October 18, 1981. She was raised in Palos Heights, Illinois and graduated from Amos Alonzo Stagg High School in 1999.

Jennifer attended Western Illinois University on an athletic scholarship and graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree majoring in Physical Education with a minor in Health Education in 2003. In 2005, Jennifer completed her second degree at Western Illinois University, a Master of Science in Kinesiology with an emphasis in Sports Management. In 2008, Jennifer earned her Certificate of Advanced Study in Educational Administration from Lewis University. In 2012, Jennifer was accepted into the doctoral program in Educational Administration and Supervision at Loyola University Chicago and earned the Superintendent Endorsement in 2015.

Jennifer has been in the field of education for the past 15 years. In 2005, Consolidated High School District 230 hired Jennifer as a physical education teacher and coach at Amos Alonzo Stagg High School. She began her administrative career serving as the Division Chair for Physical Education, Health and Driver Education at Stagg in 2009. In 2014, she was promoted to Associate Principal for Instruction.

Currently, Jennifer is serving the Orland Park community as Principal at Carl Sandburg High School. She resides in LaGrange, Illinois.

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

The dissertation submitted by Jennifer L. Tyrrell has been read and approved by the following committee:

Brigid Schultz, Ed.D., Director
Clinical Assistant Professor; Faculty Director of Dual Credit Program
Loyola University Chicago

Michael Boyle, Ph.D.
Clinical Assistant Professor; Director, Andrew M. Greeley Center for Catholic Education
(GCCE)
Loyola University Chicago

Ian MacLeod, Ph.D.
Associate Principal for Pupil Personnel Services
Amos Alonzo Stagg High School